

A
R E P L I C A T I O N
T O T H E
R E J O I N D E R :

Clayton (R)
BEING A *K*

S T A T E of the C A S E,

Together with the

HISTORY of *POPEERY*;

Containing an Account of its

RISE, PROGRESS, and DECAY.

D U B L I N :

Printed by GEORGE FAULKNER, in *Essex-street*.

M D C C X L I I I .

REPLY CATION

TO THE

RELIGIOUS

BEING A

STATE OF THE CASE



Printed by the

HISTORY OF POPERY

Containing an Account of its

RISE, PROGRESS, and DECAY.

DUBLIN:

Printed by GEORGE FAULKNER, in Beggins Street.

MDCCLXIII.

A

R E P L I C A T I O N

T O T H E

R E J O I N D E R, &c.

THE Bishop of *Cork* is concerned to find himself engaged in a Dispute, where little can be produced on either Side, except it be the Gleanings of an old, and almost exhausted Controversy : From whence, however, any Person, that is fond of disputing, and is not ashamed to make use of the same Arguments over again, may be furnished with Materials to keep up the Ball of Contention as long as he lives.

BUT the Bishop, having once taken his Pen in Hand, upon this Subject, cannot think of laying it down at present, lest his Antagonists should vainly call, their having had the last Word, a Victory ; and turn the Bishop's silent Contempt of them into a pretended Defeat. And as one Reason, which at first engaged the Bishop in this Controversy, was an ostentatious Boast of the same Nature, which the Author under Consideration seemed to make, with great Pomp, over three Protestant Clergymen, for not undertaking to answer his Treatise of the *Vau-
dois* ; so now the Bishop is determined, when he has once begun, that he

will go through with the Debate, and not leave this Author even this Pretence for a Triumph. He could wish, indeed, that he had either an abler, or a fairer Antagonist to deal with ; one that would give him either some Entertainment in the reading, or by whom he might receive some Improvement in the refuting, or one that would take an Answer. But he cannot help suspecting, that the Author of the *Rejoinder* is not the same Person who wrote the Answer to the *Pastoral Letter* ; or, at least, that he has not had the same Helps : Because it lacks the Spirit of some of the Parts of that Work, and hardly aims at a rational Answer ; but is a dull Repetition of some of the Objections made in that Piece, without taking Notice of what was said in the *Reply* ; of which there need not be a stronger Instance given than this, That the Bishop of *Cork* declared in his *Reply*, after the most solemn manner, that he had never seen the Treatise, intituled, *A brief, historical Account of the Vaudois*, till after he had published his *Pastoral Letter*. And yet in the very Preface to the *Rejoinder*, this Author has the following Words : *Such was the Case with this Author, as appeared by a Paper, printed the 22d of January last, when, upon Provocation, he found himself under a Necessity of publishing a brief, historical Account of the People called Vaudois, WHICH THE BISHOP OF CORK WAS PLEASED TO ANSWER IN HIS PASTORAL LETTER.*

WHAT can be done with such a Writer? The Bishop cannot recollect, that he ever gave this Author, or any Man living, Reason to doubt his Veracity ; and yet this Author takes upon him to contradict the Bishop in a plain Matter of Fact, the Truth of which he himself cannot possibly know, but the Bishop must. It requires a degree of Assurance, more than common, to be able to assert such a Falshood, in so undaunted a manner ; as it can only pass upon those who have not seen the *Reply*, but must be detected at the first View by every one who has. Nor can the Bishop say positively what is the Reason why this Author persists in this Error, after he has been once set right, or of what Consequence such a Trifle can be in this Dispute, it being only a Circumstance which any Person might have easily been mistaken in, and which an ingenuous Person would have given up : But he suspects that this Author is afraid of being detected in an Error, though never so trifling, by his own People, who will be furnished with the Papers written on his Side of the Question, but will be prohibited from enquiring into the other Side of the Controversy.

THIS

THIS Author has again * allowed, that the Papists in this Kingdom ought only to be upon the Defensive, and not to attack; he is therefore desirous to have it thought he did not begin the Attack; and the Reason he assigns to prove he did not begin it is, that, *upon Provocation, he found himself under a Necessity of publishing, &c.* Now let us see what this Provocation was: And this we shall find related in the Paper, intitled, *The Occasion and Subject, &c.* to have been a private Dispute between two private Persons; for the Satisfaction of one of whom this Author wrote a Treatise, which he intitled, *A brief, historical Account of the Vaudois.* So far so good. But where was the Necessity of publishing this Performance? What have this Author's private Disputes to do with the Bishop of *Cork*, and his Diocese? What have they to do with the Publick? The Bishop does not charge this Author with having begun the Attack, in private Conversation, but for beginning it in Publick; for sending his Piece to the Press; for printing it in *Cork*; and dispersing it in the Diocese of *Cork*; and not only for publishing his Treatise of the *Vaudois*, but publishing an Abstract thereof, which he gave to the Publick in a half Sheet of Paper, in such a Size, and fraught with such Arguments, as were just calculated for corrupting the Principles of the lower Sort of People. Wherein very little was said of the *Vaudois*; but wherein was contained a bold Reflection upon *Protestancy* in general, declaring it to be *no part of the Christian Religion*; and publicly challenging any Man to answer this Question, *Where was the Protestant Religion before Luther and Calvin?* It is this publick Attack upon the Principles of those, the Care of whose Souls is committed to the Bishop of *Cork*, that he complains of as an Insult upon the Laws of the Land; and as an ungrateful Return for that Lenity, which is shewed by the Protestant Magistrates, to a Number of poor, ignorant, misguided Papists, by conniving at the Residence of some Priests among them: And he is sorry to find, that Lenity, and gentle Usage, which, to a generous Mind, would be the strongest Tie to be only on the Defensive, and not to attack, has had a contrary Effect upon this Author. Nor does the Bishop charge him with Insolence for writing his Answer to the *Pastoral Letter*, as this Author would suggest, but for publishing his first Piece; and when he did write his Answer, for claiming the Benefit of the Laws of the Land in his Favour, and charging the

Bishop

Bishop with a Breach of them ; which the Bishop did, and doth still, think to be a high Degree of Insolence.

THE Bishop likewise thinks, that the Time, which was taken by this Author for publishing his Performance, was something remarkable ; when the united Arms of *France* and *Spain*, those nursing Parents of *Popery*, threatned the Liberty of *Europe* ; and raised the Spirits of the discontented Papists in this Kingdom to hope for a new Revolution. It is but a few Years since we have been relieved by the glorious Arms of our late Deliverer King *William* from the Thraldom and Slavery of *Popery*. And the Alteration made thereby in the Property of the Subject is of so late a Date, that there is hardly an Estate in the Hand of a Protestant, to which there is not some latent Claim in the Hand of a Papist. The dispersing therefore of these Papers, at this Time, seemed to have some other View, than barely *the Glory of God*. And indeed this Author, in the very Entrance to his Preface, confesses, That there may be an *unseasonable Time*, even for religious Disputes ; which, however, says he, *may, at furthest, be called the Effect of too indiscreet a Zeal, liable to the Reprehension of Church Superiors*. Where the Bishop cannot but observe the intrepid Behaviour of this Author, in disclaiming and disowning so publicly all Obedience to the temporal Powers, denying their Authority over him, and appealing to the Church alone for Reprehension.

THE Independency of the Church upon the State, is, with regard to Society, as dangerous a Doctrine as any that is supported by the Church of *Rome* ; and is as abhorrent from Reason, as it is from the Doctrines of true Christianity, which commands *every * Soul to be subject unto the higher Powers* : And St. Paul explains this Term of *higher Powers*, by calling them afterwards † *Rulers*, who ‖ *bear the Sword*. Now, if we consider, that there are at present in this Kingdom, upwards of four thousand Popish secular Priests, besides numberless Troops of seminary Priests and Friars, what an independent Crowd of Incendiaries and Trumpeters to Rebellion is there here kept up, and maintained at the Expence, and to the great impoverishing, of the lower sort of People ; as well as to the manifest Danger of the State ? And as this Part of the Sentence seems to have been added unnecessarily, the Bishop cannot conceive any Reason for this Author's inserting it so *unseasonably*, and, as he thinks, imprudently ; unless it were

* Rom. xiii. 1. † Ver. 3. ‖ Ver. 4.

were to shew his Contempt of that Government, which he is indulged to live under: Since, by this very Sentence, all the pretty Compliments, paid to *the Powers that be*, by the Authors of the Answer to the Bishop's *Pastoral Letter*, are entirely overturned; and the *Tribute* which, in the latter End of the *Rejoinder*, is said to be due to *Cæsar*; is, by this Doctrine, confined to the Laity to pay: The Allegiance of the Clergy depending upon the Will of their *Church Superiors*; the Loyalty of which, I believe, no body can be ignorant of, who considers what kind of Tribute the Pope desires should be paid to his Majesty King *George*.

THUS far having considered this Author's most audacious Preface, the Treatise itself comes next to be taken Notice of. And here the Bishop cannot but remark, that this Author's great Endeavours seem to be levelled at shifting off the main Question; which was, Whether Protestantism or Popery has the best Claim to be called a *Part of the Christian Religion*? This Author having positively asserted, that * *Protestantism was no part of the Christian Religion*. And the Bishop, in his *Pastoral Letter*, having undertaken to shew, by comparing the Doctrines of Protestantism and Popery with the Scriptures of the *New Testament*, that the Doctrines of Protestantism were entirely agreeable thereto, but the Doctrines of Popery inconsistent therewith. This Author, in his Answer thereto, in order to decline the Danger of so close a Combat, called upon the Bishop to shew, † *When did the Change begin? Who were the first and principal Authors of it? Where did Popery make its Entrance? Was it in the East, West, North, or South?* To which the Bishop replied, That such Questions were all unnecessary and foreign to the Dispute; and though they might be answered, yet this Method of proceeding would be tedious, and involve this Controversy in historical Disputes, fit only for the Perusal of the Learned. And whereas this Author had made use of a Similitude between two Persons going to law for an Estate, and said, || *Will it be ridiculous or nonsensical, for one of them to ask the other, Who he is? From whence is he come?* The Bishop, that he might comply with the Advice of *Solomon*, and § *answer a Fool according to his Folly*, made use of the same Similitude, and shewed, that those sort of Questions, where the Contest was not personal, would be quite imper-

* *Oscas. and Subj.* † Answer to the *Pastoral Letter*, p. 8. || Page 6.
§ *Prov. xxvi. 5.*

tinent; and that the only true and proper Question before a Judge would be, Whether the Claimant had any Title Deeds to prove his Claim? And not who he was? Or whence he came? Whether from *East, West, North, or South*? And yet this Author, not being willing to take this for an Answer, goes on again, with insisting upon a further Answer to these Questions.

WHOEVER is versed in Ecclesiastical History must know, that such an Enquiry, critically pursued, would be tedious; because the Corruptions of the Church of *Rome* did not come to their Height at once, but by slow and gradual Advances, in Times of Persecution or Ignorance; when few or uncertain Records only were kept. And as the Bishop, at first, did by no means design these Papers for the Learned, but for the Service of those of the lower sort of People in his Diocese, who are liable to be imposed upon by false and sophistical Arguments; he therefore was desirous of avoiding all learned Debates, which were not absolutely necessary to the Point in Question. For the Bishop assures this Author, that could he have supposed, that none but Persons accustomed to Argumentation would have read the Papers written by this Author, he would not have given himself the Trouble of answering them. Not that the Bishop declines now giving this Author some Satisfaction, with regard to these very Questions, when it can be easily introduced, without misleading him from the main Design: But at present he is willing to have it taken for granted, that the Protestants could not point out the critical Time of the Commencement of each Popish Error, since he does not see what this Concession will avail. When our Saviour refuted the corrupt Traditions of the Pharisees, they neither had Folly, nor Assurance enough, to demand of him, *When did they begin? Where did this Tradition commence? Who was the Author of it?* &c. Nor did our Saviour attempt to convince them of these Particulars; but he applied himself to the Law of *Moses*, and shewed them, that their Traditions were contradictory thereto. In like manner are the Doctrines of Protestantism to be proved, and the Doctrines of Popery to be refuted, by comparing them with the Doctrines of the *New Testament*. For the true Question is, Are they agreeable to the Scriptures of the *New Testament*, or not? Since if they are not agreeable thereto, their having been practised for never so long a time, in any Church whatsoever, will not make them to be the Doctrines of Christ. It may
be

be a Proof of their having been so long the Doctrine of this or that Church ; but that does not prove them to be the Doctrine of Christ, unless it can also be shewed, that they are consonant to the Doctrines contained in the Scriptures of the *New Testament*.

If this Author had denied Transubstantiation, the Supremacy of the Pope, Communion in one Kind, &c. to have been the Doctrines of Popery, he might fairly have left his Antagonist upon the Proof thereof, and have insisted on his shewing when did they commence? Or by what Council were they established? &c. But since he is pleased to acknowledge them, and to declare, that * *by Popery he understands the Doctrine of the bodily Presence of J. C. in the Lord's Supper, by way of Transubstantiation; the Sacrifice of the Mass; Communion under one Kind; the Bishop of Rome's Supremacy; the Invocation of Saints; Prayers for the Dead, &c.* the Question is, Are these Errors, or not? And not, when did they commence? For if they are Errors, they ought to be reformed; and if they have been long in Practice, so much more the Pity, then they ought to have been so much the sooner reformed.—But the Reformation can never begin, till after the Error has been some time in Practice, even long enough to give general Discontent. And therefore as the Error must always precede the Reformation, the Reformation will always appear *new*, in Comparison with the Errors, though the Doctrine established by the Reformation be exactly the same with that which was originally instituted.

BUT nothing surely can be more absurd, than this Author's putting the Bishop upon proving the Scriptures of the *New Testament* to be the Word of God. The Bishop had, by way of Argument, in the fore-mentioned Similitude of two Persons going to law for an Estate, said, that the Title Deeds which the Protestants produce, are the Scriptures of the *New Testament*; to invalidate which, this Author says, || *Where then could the Authors of the Reformation, or their Adherents, find the Holy Bible, after that long and universal Deluge of Idolatry? † What Means can we think of from Heaven, or on Earth, that Protestants may justify they have a true Bible?* If this Question was proposed to the Bishop by a Deist, he assures this Author, that he would not go to the Church of Rome for Proof thereof, but to the *Alexandrian MSS.* now in *England*, which bears the manifest Marks of an Anti-
quity

B

quity of near one thousand three hundred Years; and would trace up the Doctrines contained therein to the Time of the Apostles; by Quotations taken from *Origen*, the Catechist of *Alexandria*, and from *Irenæus*, the Disciple of *Polycarpe*, who was Contemporary with *St. John*. But suppose we should take it for granted, that the Protestants could not prove the Truth of the Bible, but by means of the Church of *Rome*: If the Protestants, in their Controversies with the Papists, are willing to allow the Bible, which is produced by the Papists, as a genuine Work, are the Papists any thing prejudiced thereby? Did ever any Man before make it an Objection, that his own Evidences are allowed to be good ones? Or call upon his Antagonist to prove the Credibility of those Witnesses, that were produced by himself? Has the Bishop quoted one Text, that is not acknowledged by the Papists to be the Word of God? Nay, has he not, for fear of unnecessary Cavils, quoted the Texts of Scripture he produces for his Proofs, in their own Words, out of their own licensed Translations? What is it then to the Purpose, in the present Controversy, whether the Protestants can prove they have a true Bible or not? For though this might be a proper Objection from a Deist, or an Infidel; yet it is certainly quite preposterous and absurd in the Mouth of a Papist.

AND now we come to the Remarks which his Author proposes to add to what he has already * said, in answer to the Texts of Scripture quoted in the *Pastoral Letter*. And, first, he begins with finding fault with the Bishop, for not taking Notice of the Apology which he makes for *St. Paul's* Behaviour to *St. Peter*, when *St. Paul* says, That he resisted *Peter* to his Face; and declares, that *Peter* was reprehensible. In which Apology this Author says, that † a Servant may oppose and reprimand his Master; and a private Clergyman may, and ought, respectfully, to reprimand his Bishop, when doing what may prejudice the Publick. But the Reason why the Bishop took no Notice of this Part of the Apology was, because he apprehended the Fallacy of the Argument to be so plain, that no body could avoid seeing it. For is there not a wide Difference between an Inferior reprimanding his Superior, respectfully, and reprimanding him disrespectfully? To make this Argument, therefore, have any Force, this Author should have pointed out the Words in this Reprimand that denote any Respect, any degree of Superiority acknowledged by *St. Paul* as due to *St. Peter*. The want

* *Rejoin.* p. 12. and 13. † *Ans. to Past. Let.* p. 13.

want of which seems to have been the very Reason, why this Author added in those Words at the Close of his Apology, which the Bishop did take Notice of: That *this was probably done with Peter's own Consent, the better to persuade the Galatians.* Which this Author may call a *pious Fraud*, if he does not like the Word *Collusion*. For the Bishop leaves both it, and the Remark made thereon, to the Sagacity of this Author, to get rid of it as well as he can.

THE next thing under Consideration is, about obliging the Clergy to Celibacy. And under this Head, this Author takes an Opportunity of reminding the Author of the *Reply*, and of endeavouring to set him right, with regard to an Expression, in which he supposes the Replier to be in the wrong. His Words are these, * *But our Saviour, says the Author of the Reply, finds fault with the Jews for divorcing their Wives upon trivial Reasons, and taking other Wives in their Room. Here I observe, with due Submission, that he, the Replier, forgot himself greatly. He should have said, that our Saviour absolutely forbids such Divorces.* The Bishop does not well understand what this Author means by the Expression of *forgetting himself*; but he supposes that he means, that the Replier was mistaken in saying, that our Saviour found fault with the Jews for, &c. The Bishop, indeed, acknowledges, that our Saviour did *forbid such Divorces* for the future: But he appeals to all Mankind, whether our Saviour did not at the same time find fault with the Jews for what was past; for having said, † *Whoever shall put away his Wife, let him give her a Writing of Divorcement.* The Bishop therefore thinks the Replier very happy, in not having forgotten himself oftner, since he finds what a Trifle would produce a grave Reprimand from this Author.

AND now this Author || proceeds to charge the Replier with a Contradiction in p. 6. and p. 13. of the *Reply*, in the first of which Places it is said, that *a Plurality of Wives was allowed both by Jews and Gentiles.* And in the latter it is said the Bishop cannot find, that by the Law of Moses a Man was ever suffered to have more than one Wife at a time, except in the Case of Adultery. Whereas the Bishop cannot yet perceive, that there is the least Contradiction between these two Passages; because in one Place he is speaking of the Custom of the Country, and in the other of the Law of Moses. He acknowledges, that,

B 2

that, by the Traditions of the *Jews*, and the Custom of the Country, it was allowed to have more Wives than one at a Time: But, he defies this Author to prove, or to point out one single Text in the Law of *Moses*, wherein Divorces were allowed; but in the single Case of *Uncleanness* or *Nakedness in a married Woman*. And, it was in Opposition to the positive, but false Assertion of this Author, that * *Men were SUFFERED BY THE LAW OF MOSES to have several Wives together*, that the Replyer said in Answer thereto, he could not find that, by the Law of *Moses*, a Man was ever suffered to have more than one Wife at a time, except in the Case of Adultery: And, that in p. 14, for fear of being mistaken by the Reader, he again said, *Which* (Custom of a Plurality of Wives) *came in time to be frequently practised, but was never suffered by the Law of Moses*.

HOWEVER, to prove the Truth of his former Assertion, this Author quotes † *Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, David, &c.* as Persons among the Primitive People of God, whom he asserts to have had a Plurality of Wives. Where it is to be observed, that the Replyer never denied the Practice, but rather insisted upon it, as necessary towards the Support of his Argument: But only denied, that this Custom was founded on the Law of *Moses*; and, therefore, the Bishop owns himself much surprized to find *Abraham, Isaac* and *Jacob*, quoted as Instances to prove, that Persons were *suffered by the Law of Moses to have several Wives together*: The last of whom died above an hundred Years before *Moses* was born. And, if they be not produced to prove this, they are produced to no Purpose at all. But, passing over this notorious *Blunder*, let us consider the Truth of the Fact. Had *Abraham* ever more Wives than one at a time? We read of none in Scripture that are called so, but *Sarah* and *Keturah*. And the Bishop thinks, he can prove to a Demonstration, that *Keturah* was not his real Wife, but only a Concubine. They, however, who suppose *Keturah* to have been his Wife, do not pretend that *Abraham* took her to Wife till || after the Death of *Sarah*. But as for *Isaac*, the Bishop never heard before, that either by the History of *Moses*, or even the fabulous Traditions of *Jews* or *Arabs*, *Isaac* was ever supposed to have had any other Wife than *Rebecca*. It is therefore to be hoped, that this Author is better read in the Scriptures of the New Testament, than he seems

to

* Answer to the *Pastoral Letter*, p. 17. † *Rejoin.* p. 16. || See *Gen.* 23, 2. 24, 67. 25, 1.

to be in the Old. *Jacob*, indeed, had two Wives at a time, and they were Sisters, but this Author surely will not insist upon it, that that was also suffered by the Law of *Moses*, * in which this Practice is peremptorily prohibited. *David* had four Wives at the least, the *Jewish* Traditions say 18. And *Solomon*, according to the Scriptures, had seven hundred, and three hundred Concubines, which Crimes I hope God has forgiven them. And, certain it is, that the Custom of having a Plurality of Wives continued in Use in the *Jewish* State at, and after the coming of Our Saviour, though it was never suffered by the Law of *Moses*, unless this Author will maintain that it was then in the *Jewish* State, as it is now in the Church of *Rome*; and that the Traditions of the *Jews*, which, according to Our Saviour's Declaration, had rendered the Commandments of God of none Effect, were of equal Validity with the Law of *Moses*.

BUT, says our Author, this Custom was abolished by our Saviour. True. And they who had been guilty of this Fact were prohibited by St. *Paul* from being admitted into the Christian Ministry. But, surely they were not prohibited, if they had a Mind to become Christians, from being Converts, from being admitted into the Christian Church by Baptism. Suppose, for Example, that *David*, or any other pious Person, who had been ignorantly misled by the Custom of the Country, or the Traditions of the Scribes and Pharisees, to marry more Wives than one, had lived at the Time of Our Saviour's coming into the World, and had a Mind to become a Christian, is it to be imagined that, upon his unfeigned Repentance, St. *Paul* would have excluded him from being a Convert; though he absolutely excludes such from either being Bishops or Deacons?

AND in Answer to the Question which this Author puts to the Replyer, when he says, † *What does the Replyer mean, when he says, that the Plurality of Wives was allowed only in the Case of Adultery? For in the Old Law, the Woman convicted of Adultery, was to be put to Death.* The Replyer answers thereto, that he means the same that Our Saviour does, when he speaks of ¶ *Fornication* committed by a married Woman, which Our Saviour allows to be the only just Cause of Divorce: Or, what *Moses* means by a Man's finding some *Uncleanness* or *Nakedness* in his Wife, § which is the only Cause for which he allows a Divorce: Which the Replyer supposeth to be Adultery; because he cannot think

* *Deut.* xviii. 18. † *Rejoin.* p. 16. ¶ *Mat.* v. 32. § *Deut.* xxiv. 1.

of a more proper Word by which to express *Fornication, or Uncleanneſs*, committed by a married Woman.. And, as to this Author's Difficulty about * understanding what this Expression, *except in Caſe of Adultery, means*, and which he in † another Place ſays *is not intelligible*. The Biſhop cannot but obſerve, that although he thought himſelf obliged to make a Reply to this Author, yet he is under no Obligation, nor indeed is it in his Power, to furniſh him with an Underſtanding: But really is ſurprized that he is ſo ready at acknowledging the want of it. For can any Thing be more plain, than that under the *Jewiſh Law*, a Woman was not to be put to Death for Adultery, unleſs ſhe was *convicted* thereof. Now it might happen, that although a Man was ſatisfied in his own Mind || of his Wife's Infidelity, yet he might not be able to convict her. Or although he could convict her, yet he might not be inclined to bring her to open Shame; and yet, in both theſe Caſes, he ſtill had the Remedy of Divorce in his own Power. And, if this Author had not been as ignorant in the Scriptures of the New Teſtament, as he is of the Old, he would have known the laſt of theſe to have been actually the Caſe with regard to the Virgin *Mary*: Who being eſpouſed to *Joſeph*, § *was found with Child before they came together*. Now, by the ** Law of *Moses*, the Damſel ought to have been put to Death. But †† *Joſeph her Huſband being a juſt Man, and not willing to make her a publick Example, was minded to put her away privately*, that is, choſe rather to give her a Bill of Divorce. And although the Woman that was taken in Adultery, and that was brought before Our Saviour, as mentioned *John 8. 3.* was not put to Death, although taken in the Fact: Yet ſurely this Author will not deny, that her Huſband had the Remedy of Divorce in his Power, if he had pleaſed.

But nothing ſurprizes the Biſhop more than the confident Affertion of this Author, that || *in the EVANGELICAL LAW the Huſband is indeed allowed to part with his Wife AS TO BEDDING AND BOARDING, if guilty of Adultery, but the Tie of Matrimony ſtill ſubſiſting, neither of them can marry any other, while they both live*. Would not any one imagine that theſe Words *as to Bedding and Boarding*, which are ſo remarkably ſignalized in a diſtinct Character, were the Words of the *Evangelical Law*? And yet the Biſhop ventures to aſſure the Reader, that there

* Rejoin. p. 17. † Rejoin. || Vide *John viii. 3.* § *Mat. i. 18.* ** *Deut. xxi.*
23. †† *Mat. i. 19.* || Rejoin. p. 17.

there are no two such Words either in the Old or New Testament. The Interpretation of that Text of Scripture quoted by this Author out of St. *Matbew*, * in relation to Divorces, has given Occasion to very early Controversies in the Christian Church. † *Origen* is of Opinion, that the Word Fornication is only mentioned as one Instance of the Cause of Divorces. And says, that in his Time some Bishops gave Permission to those who were divorced, even on Account of Adultery, to marry again. ‖ *Tertullian's* Opinion is, that the Bond of Marriage is dissolved by Adultery, and that the Woman who is put away may marry again. And several § Councils, particularly of the *Gallican* Churches, authorize the same Custom. And although in the Church of *Rome*, at the Time of the Council of *Trent*, the contrary Opinion was declared to be the Opinion of the Church: Yet, it is to be supposed this Author is not ignorant, that the Validity of the Council of *Trent*, has never yet been acknowledged, nor its Decisions received as Authentic, even in the Church of *France*. Wherefore the Bishop of *Corke* cannot but greatly lament the unfortunate Situation of those poor Souls, who have such Conductors for their Guides, that can so peremptorily impose on them the controverted Opinions and Traditions of Men, for the Commandments of God.

BUT our Author proceeds to support the Doctrine of the Celibacy of the the Clergy from some Texts out of St. *Paul* to the † *Corinthians*, where, ‖ according to him, St. *Paul* says, *I would have you all be as myself. Now, I say to the unmarried and Widows, it is good for them if they continue so, even as I do.* Where it is very remarkable, that in the Original, and in the *Vulgate* as well as in the *Rhemish* Translation of the Bible, the Words are, *Now I would that ALL MEN were even as I myself.* And, as it is a Maxim in Reasoning, that he who proves too much, proves nothing at all; so the Bishop cannot conceive any other Reason for this Author's corrupting the Scriptures, and making such an Alteration in the Text which he quoted, but to deceive his unwary Reader, by making him imagine that this Advice was directed to the *Corinthian* Clergy alone, and not to Mankind in general. And, therefore, this Author in a most profligate Manner adds, * *could be (St. Paul) more earnestly recommend the State of Celibacy to the Clergy.* Whenever this Author attempts to

* *Mat. v. 32.* † *Orig. Hom. 7. in Mat.* ‖ *Ter. l. iv, contra Marc.* § *Counc. Arelat. i. can. 10. Aurelian ii. c. 11. Vermes c. v. vi. Compendiens. c. 11.* † *1 Cor. vii. 7, 8.*
 ‖ *Rejoin. p. 17.* * *Rejoin. p. 18.*

to meddle with the Scriptures, he perpetually exposes his own Ignorance: For, in this Place he takes it for granted, that *St. Paul's* being a married Man, is an uncontroverted Point; whereas nothing is more controvertible: And so much so, that the Probability rather lies on the other Side the Question. Because that *St. Paul*, before his Conversion, was a great Zealot for the *Mosaical Law*, and the Traditions of the Elders. Now, according to their Traditions, a ** Man was under a Command for marrying from his being sixteen or seventeen Years old: But, if he was past twenty, and had not married, he was reckoned to have violated an affirmative Precept. And *Clemens Alexandrinus* expressly says, †† that *St. Paul* in one of his Epistles mentions his Wife. Now certain it is, that *St. Paul* in his Epistle to the *Philippians*, addresses a Part in that Letter to a Woman, whom he stiles his ||| true Yoke-Fellow *Σύζυγος γνήσιη*. Which Word *Σύζυγος* answers in a literal Translation to the *Latin Word* §§ *Conjux*, a Wife or Yoke-Fellow. When therefore *St. Paul* wishes all Men to be as himself, and recommends it to the unmarried and Widows, to continue even as he; He only means in Chastity and Continence during the Absence of his Wife: Because he did not lead her about with him in his Apostolical Journeys; as the rest of the Apostles did theirs; and in particular * the Brethren of the Lord and Peter. For, says *St. Paul*, have we not Power to lead about a Sister, a Wife, as well as other Apostles, and as the Brethren of the Lord and Cephas, or Peter. The Word in the Original which is here rendered Wife, is *Γυναικα*, which undoubtedly is sometimes made Use of to denote a Woman in general, whether married or unmarried; though it is much oftener made Use of in the Scriptures to denote a Wife, than an unmarried Woman. However, it is the Context that must determine in what Sense it is to be understood: And the preceding Word *Sister* demonstrably shews, that it must be translated in this Place a Wife, because the placing the Word *Woman* after *Sister*, would otherwise be an absurd Piece of Tautology; since if she be a Sister, she must of course be a Woman, but need not be a Wife. And therefore *St. Paul* added in the Word *Γυναικα Wife*, possibly to take off the Edge of all Ridicule, in the Supposition of the Apostles leading about with them Christian Sisters, who were not their Wives. But the Church of Rome, rather than acknowledge that *Peter* had a Wife, have corrupted this Text of Scripture, and inverted the Order

** *Lightfoot* vol. ii. p. 757. †† *Clemen. Alex. Strom.* l. iii. p. 448. ||| *Phil.* v. 13. §§ *Con-juges*, says *Festus*, sunt ejusdem Jugi pares. * *1 Cor.* ix. 5.

Order of the Words, and instead of rendering these Words *Ἀδελφὴ* *ἑταῖρα* *Sororem Uxorem*, as they ought to have done, have in the Vulgate Translation of the Bible rendered them *Mulierem, Sororem, a Woman, a Sister*; because that *Sororem, Mulierem* would be manifest Tautology, as is already observed; and *Sororem, Uxorem, a Sister, a Wife*, as it is placed in the Original, though it be the Truth, yet would prove St. Peter and the Brethren of our Lord, to have cohabited with their Wives during their Apostleship. It is likewise to be observed, that St. Paul introduces this Doctrine with saying, † *But I speak this of Permission, and not of Commandment*. And concludes in the Verse immediately following this Author's Quotation with saying, || *But if they cannot contain, let them marry: For it is better to marry than burn*. Why then did this Author stop his Hand, and not finish the Sentence? The Reason is plain, because his Intention was to deceive, and not to instruct. Now, if all Christians, Laity as well as Clergy, were strictly to follow the first Part of St. Paul's Advice, which is supposed to recommend an unmarried Life, what would become of Christianity? It would certainly be the readiest Method that can be conceived to make the Gates of Hell prevail against it. In the Interpretation therefore of this Text of Scripture, we are to consider the whole Drift and Purport of the Author, and not one Sentence, or half of a Sentence, as independent on the rest. And then we shall find St. Paul explaining himself very fully in the 25th and 26th Verses of this Chapter. *Now concerning Virgins, I have no Commandment of the Lord: yet I give my Judgment as one that hath obtained Mercy of the Lord to be faithful. I suppose, therefore, that this is good for THE PRESENT DISTRESS, I say, that it is good for a Man so to be.* Whence it is manifest, that at the best, this was only a prudential Piece of Advice given on account of the then *present Distress*; and referred entirely to the present and impending Persecutions: And affected the Laity equally with the Clergy: But, let us suppose this Advice had been given only to the Clergy, and not to the Laity, surely there is a wide Difference between recommending and commanding; between permitting a Man to use his own Prudence, if he found he could not contain, and to marry rather than burn; and obliging a Man to make a Vow of Celibacy whether he can or cannot contain. For that they who make Vows of Celibacy cannot always contain, has been too frequently known in the World; and

and that not only among the inferior Clergy, but even among the pretended Successors of *St. Peter*, for to produce only two Instances out of many. Pope *Steven II.* was the acknowledged Son of Pope *Constantine*.^{*} And according to † *Dupin*, there were Depositions given in upon Oath, by fourteen Witnesses, against Pope *Boniface VIII.* of his having been guilty of several Kinds of Impiety and Sodomy. And Pope *Pius II.* was so strongly of this Opinion, that he declared, || although he saw many good Reasons, why the Clergy ought not to marry; yet he saw much better ones why they should.

AND because this Author has been so very pressing to know *when did the Change happen? Who were the first and principal Authors of it? Where did Popery make its first Entrance?* I will gratify him a little with regard to this Point of the Celibacy of the Clergy, because it will manifestly appear from the few Records of Ecclesiastical History, that are left of the first and purest Ages of the Church, that *from the Beginning* it was not so. And to prove this, I shall, to avoid all unnecessary Disputes, only refer this Author to a Book that was written by one of his own Communion, by the learned *Dupin*, Doctor of the *Sorbon* in *Paris*, and who lived and died in the Communion of the Church of *Rome*; whose Authority, therefore, I believe this Author will not controvert. Now Dr. *Dupin*, in that Part of his Works where he is giving us an *Abridgment of the Discipline of the THREE FIRST AGES of the Church*, positively declares, that *it was lawful for Priests to keep the Wives they married before they were ordained, but Marriage was not permitted after Ordination; but both the one and the other was allowed to Deacons.* Whence it is manifest, that the Celibacy of *Deacons* was not established in the Church till the Fourth Century, at the soonest: Nor was it even then received in the Church without much Contest. For in the 10th Canon of the Council of *Ancyra*, in the 4th Century, it was there decreed, that if a Deacon declared at the Time of his Ordination that he would marry, he should not be deprived of his Function if he did marry; but if he was ordained without this Declaration, and afterwards married, then he should be obliged to quit his Employment. The 4th Canon of the Council of *Gangra*, in the same Century, but 50 Years later, declares its Sentiments against those who said, we must not take the Communion from the Hand of a married

^{*} *Dupin*, Cent. 8. p. 108. [†] *Dupin*, Cent. 14. p. 7, 11, 12. || *Platina in Vita Pii*, 2.

a married Priest. In the Beginning of the 5th Century, in the 70th Cannon in the Council of *Carthage*, it is ordained, that Bishops, Priests and Deacons shall have no more to do with their Wives, under Pain of Degradation. In which Age there was a learned Contest on Foot, between *Jovinian* and *St. Jerome*, about the Marriage of the Clergy. *Socrates* the Historian, who wrote in this Century, declares, that in the East, the Clerks and Bishops abstained from their Wives, but that it was of their own Accord, and without being obliged to it by any Law: But, that there were many who had Children by their Wives while they were Bishops. In the 22d Canon of the Council of *Carthage*, in the 39th Year of this Century, it was ordained, that for the future no married Persons shall be ordained Deacons, unless they make a Profession of living in Chastity. But the 24th Canon, excepts from this Law, those who have been ordained heretofore. In the Letter from *Lupus* Bishop of *Troyes*, and *Euphronius* Bishop of *Augustodunum*, written in this Century to *Thalassius* Bishop of *Anjou*, there are these Words, *That it were better for the Clergy to abstain from Marriage, but in this, they must follow the Custom of the Churches.* In the Council of *Tours*, held in the 61st Year of this Century, the 1 and 2 Canons only recommend a single Life to the Bishops, Priests and Deacons. And it was not till towards the latter End of the 7th Century, that the Celibacy of the Clergy, even of Priests, was thoroughly established in the Church of *Constantinople*; for, in the 3d Canon of that Council, held *Ann.* 692, it is declared, that those of the Clergy, who had married Widows, or had married, being Priests, Deacons, or Subdeacons, should be suspended from their Functions; which plainly shews, that the Marriage of Priests had continued in Practice in that Church till that Time.

THIS, however, one may certainly be positive in, that the Marriage of Priests before Ordination, or of Deacons either before or after Ordination, was not prohibited till the Fourth Century, at the soonest; and, therefore, that the Primitive Church, during the three first and purest Ages of Christianity, understood those Words of *St. Paul* to *Timothy*, where he advises, that a * *Bishop be the Husband of one Wife*, and † that *the Deacons be the Husbands of one Wife*, as only excluding those Persons from the Ministry, who had more than one Wife at a time.

C 2

As

* 1 Tim. iii. 2.

† 1 Tim. iii. 12.

As to the Doctrine of *Prayers in an unknown Tongue*, the Bishop thinks he might possibly have had some Difficulty in detecting the Fallacies of this Author's Arguments, in dragging him out of his lurking Places, and exposing him to the Light; if he did not so frequently bolt of himself. But Truth will out. And accordingly this Author acknowledges, that * *in the Beginning Mass was said every where in the vulgar Tongue of each Country*. Was not then the Primitive Church so far Protestant? And were there not, according to his own Confession, Protestants, with regard to Prayers in an unknown Tongue, before either *Luther* or *Calvin*? The Bishop does not desire him to acknowledge any thing more: Since he thinks there cannot possibly be a better Exposition given of the Doctrine of the Apostles, than the Practice of the Church during the Life Time of the Apostles. It lies, therefore, now upon this Author to prove, why this Alteration was made; and to shew that the Successors of the Apostles were wiser Men than the Apostles themselves: And that the common People now understand the learned Languages better than they did, even when they had the miraculous Gift of Tongues to assist them.

As to that Expression of our Author's in his former Treatise, of a *Language absolutely unknown*; which the Replyer charged with being Nonsense. The Bishop owns, that he doth not think it worth a Contest, whether it is, or is not; but apprehends that this Author sinks deeper at every Flounce that he gives to get himself out of the Mud.

As to the Word *Sacrifice*, which this Author seems to insist upon, the Bishop thinks all those *Strifes of Words* beneath his Attention; were it not that he is unwilling to leave this Author without an Answer to the minutest Particular. In his Pastoral Letter and in the Reply, the Bishop was willing to try what Effect gentle Usage would have upon this Author, but since he finds him insensible and unmoved by that Kind of Treatment, he thinks it necessary at present to give him now and then a little *Correction*; he also endeavoured in those two Performances to be as short as possible, and carefully avoided entering into any Dispute, but what was absolutely necessary towards the main Point: But since that Method of Reasoning will not satisfy, or at least silence this Author, the Bishop is now determined to follow him Step by Step, and pursue his Track, till he has hunted him down, and driven him out of the Field. And therefore the Bishop desires this Author to pro-

produce one Text in the whole New Testament, where the Sacrament of the Eucharist is termed a *Sacrifice*. Some of the Primitive Fathers have indeed made use of that Word, but not in the same Sense that it is now made use of in the Church of *Rome*: For they used it to denote a Commemorative Sacrifice, and not a Propitiatory one. And in that Sense, to avoid Disputes about Words, it is now made use of by Protestant Divines. For how can a Real Sacrifice be performed in *Remembrance* of itself? The Word * *Remembrance*, which was the Word made use of by Christ at the Institution of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, necessarily supposing the Absence of the Thing remembered. And the very Institution of this Sacrament of the Eucharist, *before the Death of our Saviour*, shews to a Demonstration, that this Sacrament could not possibly be a Sacrifice. Because then Christ must have been sacrificed before he really was sacrificed. Let us suppose; that Christ at the Institution of the Lord's Supper could have given his Disciples his real Body to be eaten, yet it was absolutely impossible for him to have given them his † *Body broken* to be eaten, or his § *Blood shed* to be drunk, before his Body had been broken, or his Blood shed. Since a Thing cannot possibly have been before it really was, and we may say without any Impeachment of the Omnipotence of God, that this is one of those natural Contradictions, which it is not in his Power to perform, any more than it is in his Power to tell a Lie. Those Words therefore of our Saviour at the Institution of the Eucharist, this is my Body || *which is given for you*, are Figuratively, or Typically to be understood of what was to come to pass; as the repeating of them now is Commemorative of what is past.

BUT now our Author comes to the famous Point of Transubstantiation, upon which though he is very short at present, yet as his Words are very remarkable, and contain a Doctrine loaded with Blasphemy, he shall, by the Blessing of God, have a full, and as the Bishop hopes, a satisfactory Answer. The Bishop in his Pastoral Letter had remarked upon this Subject, that St. *Paul*, in his Account of the Institution of the Eucharist, had called the Element of Bread after Consecration

* *Lu. xxii. 19.* I. *Cor. 11, 24, 25.* † I. *Cor. xi. 24.* § *Mat. xvi. 28.* *Mark xiv. 22.* *Lu. xxii. 20.*—The Bishop thinks it proper to give this Author Notice, that these four Texts of Scripture are wrong translated in the Vulgate, which was published by the Authority of, The Infallible, Holy, Catholick, Apostolick, Church of *Rome*, but that the above Translation is right. || *Lu. ii. 19.* This Text is rightly translated in the Vulgate, though the Method of Expression in the Original is exactly the same with the four preceding Texts. See Page 23, 24.

cration, thrice in one Passage, by the plain Name of *Bread*. In answer to which this Author said, * *So does the Bishop of Rome, &c. But what Bread? The Bread of Life; the Bread descended from Heaven; his own Flesh, to which his Soul and Divinity are inseparably united, &c.* Upon which the Replyer insisted that St. Paul must mean plain *Bread only*, and not the *Bread of Life*: Because he supposes the unworthy Receiver to eat of it, as well as the worthy; and it is presumed that this Author will not insist on it, that the unworthy Receiver eats the Bread of Life. In answer to which, the Author of the Rejoinder says, † *But I must beg leave to tell him (the Replyer) that he must join the Author of the Answer, and all those of his Communion in this Particular, and allow that the worthy and sacrilegious Communicant receive the SAME BREAD OF LIFE.* Vain Man! How conceited a Thing is Ignorance! Not content with uttering his own Follies, he expects to make Converts of the Bishop and of all those of his Communion. But let us hear his Reason. *Did not treacherous Judas, says he, receive from the Hand of our Saviour, the very same Bread that Peter and the rest of the Apostles did?* To which the Bishop answers, Yes. He did. But continues this Author, *that Bread was the Bread of Life; was the Body and Blood of Christ (if you vouchsafe to believe himself) and so do all unworthy Receivers.* To which the Bishop answers, God forbid, that he should not believe the Words of his Lord and Saviour *Jesus Christ*; but he will not take *his Words* from this Author's Mouth, while he can have recourse to the Scriptures. And now let us see what are the Words of our Saviour upon this Head as delivered therein, what Character does he give of the *Bread of Life*, and of the Effects of eating thereof, and we shall find thereby, whether the sacrilegious Communicant eateth thereof or not. And of this we shall meet with a full Description in the 6th Chapter of St. *John*. || *I am the Bread of Life*, says our Saviour, *he that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst.* Now the Bishop would ask any one living whether this can be properly applied to the unworthy, as well as the worthy Receiver; and to the wicked, as well as the pious Believer? But to proceed; he says again, § *I am that Bread of Life. Your Fathers did eat Manna in the Wilderness and are dead. This is the Bread which cometh down from Heaven, that a Man may eat thereof and not die. I am the living*

* *Ans.* p. 24, 25. † *Rejoin.* p. 22. || v. 35. § v. 48, 49, 50, 51.

living Bread, which came down from Heaven: if any Man eat of this Bread, he shall live for ever: And the Bread that I will give is my Flesh, which I will give for the Life of the World. * Whofo eateth my Flesh and drinketh my Blood, bath eternal Life, and I will raise him up at the last Day. For my Flesh is Meat indeed, and my Blood is Drink indeed. He that eateth my Flesh and drinketh my Blood, dwelleth in me and I in him. As the living Father bath sent me, and I live by the Father: so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me. This is that Bread which came down from Heaven: not as your Fathers did eat Manna, and are dead: HE THAT EATETH THIS BREAD SHALL LIVE FOR EVER. Are these Blessed Promises Characteristicks that belong to the unworthy as well as to the worthy Receiver? If we do but substitute or change equivalent Expressions one for another, the Truth will work itself out, as it does in Algebra. And now let us try how it will sound if we insert *the unworthy as well as the worthy Receiver*, instead of those Words, *He who eateth the Bread of Life*. The unworthy, as well as the worthy Receiver, shall never die; the unworthy, as well as the worthy Receiver, shall live for ever; the unworthy, as well as the worthy Receiver, bath eternal Life, and Christ will raise him up at the last Day. The unworthy, as well as the worthy Receiver, dwelleth in Christ and Christ in him. The unworthy, as well as the worthy Receiver, shall live by Christ. The unworthy, as well as the worthy Receiver, shall live for Ever. Can any thing be more absurd, or more impious to assert? And yet this is the necessary Consequence of the Doctrine of Transubstantion, which indeed if it were true, would prove a most extraordinary and useful Viaticum, for other People, as well as for Judas.

WHAT I have here said, I think, might serve as an Answer to this Author, but as this is a Subject of great Importance, and cannot be too fully explained, I shall beg the learned Reader's Pardon for being something more explicit upon this Head.

OUR Saviour a little before his Death, † *The same Night in which he was betrayed, took Bread; and when he had given Thanks he brake it, and said, Take, eat; this is my Body which is § BROKEN for you: this do in Remembrance of me. After the same Manner also he took the Cup, when he had supped, saying, This Cup is the new Testament in my Blood: This do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in Remembrance of me.* This was the Form

* v. 54, 55.

† I. Cor. xi. 23, 24, 25.

§ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν κλάμενον.

Form and Method of the Institution of the Lord's Supper, as revealed by our Saviour to St. Paul. St. Matthew expresseth it thus. * *And as they were eating, Jesus took Bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the Disciples, and said, take, eat; this is my Body. And he took the Cup, and gave Thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye ALL of it: For this is my Blood of the New Testament, which is § SHED for many for the Remission of Sins.* St. Mark relates it thus. † *And as they did eat, Jesus took Bread and blessed and brake it, and gave to them and said, take, eat; this is my Body. And he took the Cup, and when he had given Thanks, he gave it to them: and they ALL drank of it. And he said unto them, This is my Blood of the New Testament, which || IS SHED for many.* St. Luke relates it thus. ‡ *And he took Bread and gave Thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them, saying, This is my Body which IS §§ GIVEN for you: This do in Remembrance of me. Likewise also the Cup after Supper, saying, This Cup is the New Testament in my Blood, which ** IS SHED for you.* I have quoted these several Accounts of the Institution, because I am willing to give the Doctrine of Transubstantiation its full Force. It is therefore to be observed, that in every one of these Accounts the Writers all agree in declaring, that our Saviour speaking of the Element of Bread, said, *This is my Body.* And though when speaking of the Cup St. Paul and St. Luke declare, that he said, *This is the New Testament in my Blood:* And not, *This is my Blood of the New Testament,* which makes a very considerable Difference. Yet, as the Bishop does not desire to insist upon Niceties, he waves this Distinction for the present, and supposes that the Words of the Institution were *this is my Blood of the New Testament,* as St. Matthew and St. Mark relate it.

AND now the Question is, how these Words, *This is my Body, and this is my Blood,* are to be understood. Every Body who allows the Divine Authority of the Scriptures, readily agrees to acknowledge, that these Words are undoubtedly true; and that Christ can and will certainly fulfill them; but the Question is, How? Which Men, of more Curiosity than Judgment, having endeavoured to explain, have divided the Members of the Catholick Church of Christ into various Opinions; three of the Principal of which will be sufficient to be laid before

* Mat. xxvi. 26. § *ἡχθρόμαρον* † Mar. xiv. 22. || *ἡχθρόμαρον* ‡ Lu. xxii. 19. §§ *Διδομαρον* Hoc est corpus meum quod pro vobis datur. ** *ἡχθρόμαρον*

before you. One is, that whoever eateth that Bread, eateth along therewith the actual, real, and true Body of Christ. And therefore the Patrons of that Opinion, insist upon a literal Interpretation of those Words, *This is my Body*. Which Doctrine is supported by *Luther* and his followers, and is commonly known by the Name of *Consubstantiation*. Another Opinion is, that whoever eateth that Bread, eateth not Bread, but only the actual, real, and true Body of *Jesus Christ*, and the Patrons thereof assert, that, tho' the sensible Properties of the Bread remain after Consecration, the Substance of the Bread is transubstantiated into the Substance of the Body of Christ, which is the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*. Now of these two Opinions, the first seemeth to be the most Rational, because all the Texts of Scripture, which the *Romanists* produce to prove the Real Presence of our Saviour's Body in the Sacrament, are made use of by the *Lutherans* to the same Purposes. And the only Difference betwixt them is, Whether the Substance of the Bread remaineth there, or not, after Consecration. Now the *Lutherans* have this Advantage over the *Romanists* in this Dispute, that they have an Affirmative to prove, which they can prove to be true by the same Method that they can prove the Truth of the Existence of any Thing in this World; that is, the Evidence of their Senses, which was the Evidence that our Saviour referred those Persons to, who were sent from *John* to enquire whether he was the Christ. For he said unto them, *Go your way and tell John what Things you have seen and heard, &c.* And indeed if we are not to believe our Senses, in sensible Matters, there is an end of all Certainty whatsoever. They have likewise a Proof from Scripture, that the real Substance, and true Nature of the Bread and Wine remain also even after Consecration. Because in that reproof which *St. Paul* gives the *§ Corinthians* for their disorderly Behaviour at the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. He charges them with getting drunk in Church, in the House of God, and eating rather to satisfy Hunger than to commemorate Christ. Whence it is manifest, that the natural and true Substance both of the Bread and Wine, remained after Consecration. But the *Romanists* to support their Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* have a Negative to prove; which according to all the Maxims of Reasoning, is not capable of Proof. For they must not only prove the Real Presence of the Body

D

§ I. Cor. xi. 21, 22.

of our Saviour in the Eucharist, but they must also prove that the Substance of the Bread is not there. For otherwise they prove nothing but *Consubstantiation*. The third Opinion is, that these Words are certainly true, but not literally so; and must be figuratively understood. Which is the Opinion of *Calvin* and the reformed Churches of *England* and *Ireland*. And one Reason, which they give for this, is the frequent Use of Metaphors in the New Testament. Thus Christ calleth himself a *Door*, and a *Vine*, &c. And to quote a Passage more nearly related to the present Subject, our Saviour says, * *He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his Belly shall flow Rivers of living Water.* And in another Place, § *But whosoever drinketh of the Water that I shall give him, shall never thirst; but the Water that I shall give him, shall be in him a Well of Water, springing up into everlasting Life.* Now it is presumed that no-body will assert that these Texts are literally to be interpreted, and that he who believeth in Christ is literally to have Rivers of living Water flowing out of his Belly, or a Well of Water springing up within him. Because such an Interpretation would be inconsistent both with Reason and our Senses. In like Manner, because the Words of the Institution of the Eucharist, when literally interpreted, seem neither consistent with our Reason, nor our Senses, nor with other Parts of the Holy Scriptures, therefore it has been thought more consistent both with Reason, with our Senses, and with the Scriptures, to give them a figurative Interpretation. I believe there need not much Pains be taken to shew, that the literal Interpretation of the Words of the Institution of the Eucharist is above our Reason to account for, and that it is contradictory to our Senses; but it will be sufficient if it can be shewed that it is not consistent with the Doctrine of Christ, as contained in other Parts of the Scriptures. Now it manifestly appears from the Texts already quoted out of *St. John*, that whoever eateth the Flesh of Christ *hath eternal Life*; that *he shall never die*; but *live for ever*, &c. If therefore the Element of Bread in the Eucharist be either consubstantiated, or transubstantiated, then whoever eateth that Bread, eateth also the *Flesh of Christ*, and shall of Consequence, whether he be a worthy or unworthy Receiver, enjoy *eternal Life*. But *St. Paul* positively declares, that the unworthy Receiver *eateth and drinketh Damnation to himself*. It will therefore follow, that those Words of our Saviour in the Institution

* *John* vii. 38.§ *John* iv. 14.

tution of the Sacrament, ought to be understood in such a Manner, as that the Element of Bread, when given to a worthy Receiver, should be the Bread of Life; but to the unworthy, should be the Bread of Condemnation. Or as St. Paul, when speaking of the Gospel, says, that it may be *the Medicine of Life unto Life to the one; but the Medicine of Death unto Death to the other*. Which can only be effected by supposing this Presence of Christ's Body in the Sacrament, to be after a Spiritual Manner, so as only to be really given to, and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper, but not by the faithless and unworthy.

THERE is, indeed, a most dreadful Consequence to be drawn from the Literal Interpretation of the Words of the Institution, which is so shocking to think of, that one would be inclined to seek for the most figurative Interpretation, rather than assent to it. And that is, that if a Bit of this Bread should drop to the Ground after Consecration, and a Mouse or a Rat meet with it, and eat it, that this Mouse or this Rat would eat the actual real Body and Blood of *Jesus Christ* now Triumphant at the Right Hand of God in Heaven: Would eat that Bread of Life which is to conduct Mankind into Eternal Life; would dwell in *Christ* and *Christ* in them. Horrid and tremendous Blasphemy! Impute it not unto them, O my God! for they know not what they say.

BUT, says this Author, * *If the unworthy Communicant does not eat the Bread of Life, what should make his Crime so enormous? The eating of plain Bread could never carry so dreadful a Consequence as Judgment and Damnation*. No, indeed, the eating of plain Bread could not, but the eating of plain Bread irreligiously, which was commanded to be eaten with a religious Intent, may deserve Judgment and Damnation. The eating a Plain Lamb among the *Jews*, could never carry so dreadful a Consequence as Judgment and Damnation; but the eating of the Pascal Lamb, without recollecting the End of the Institution, certainly might. In like manner Our Saviour had commanded, that whenever we eat that Bread, or drink that Cup, we should do it † *in Remembrance of him*. Is it not therefore a Profanation of this religious Institution, to perform that highest Act of our religious Worship, and not remember him, not *discern*, not recollect the Lord's Body. In which Sense the Original Word, which we translate *discern*, seems to be made Use of in the next Verse but one following.

D 2

1 Cor. xi.

* *Rejoind. p. 22.*

† 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25.

ιαυτοῖς Δικαιοῦμεν For if we recollect ourselves, we should not be judged.

AND now to give our Author some Satisfaction upon this Head, with regard to his favourite Questions, *when did the Change happen? Who were the first and principal Authors of it? Where did Popery make its first Entrance?* It is certain that the Doctrine of the real bodily Presence of our Lord *Jesus Christ* in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, as it is understood by the *Lutherans*, (that is without insisting on the Annihilation of the Substance of the Bread, which is the Doctrine of the *Romanists*) though it has no ancient Councils to support it; yet is countenanced by many Expressions in the ancient Fathers, who in the Warmth of their Zeal speak of the real Presence in very strong Terms. And if they did not at other times speak of the Figurativeness of this Expression, and of the Spirituality of the Presence of *Christ* in the Sacrament, and not of the Reality of it, would be a strong Circumstance in Favour of this Opinion. As for Example, *St. Augustine*, the great Doctor of the *Latin Church*, is frequently quoted both by the *Lutherans* and *Romanists* for many Expressions in Favour of the real Presence; and it must be allowed, that many of his Expressions, when taken as detached Sentences, seem to countenance this Opinion; as some Expressions among Protestant Writers would, if taken separately and distinctly from the rest of their Writings. But what is a demonstrable Proof that *St. Augustine* never designed that his own Expressions should be taken literally, any more than those of Our Saviour in the Institution of the Eucharist, is his Exposition of *Jobn vi. 53.* In his Treatise *de Doctrina Christiana*, where laying down some Rules for the Interpretation of the Scriptures, he says, that a Person ought no more to interpret the literal Expressions figuratively, than he ought to interpret the Figurative ones literally; and after laying down several Rules whereby to judge, whether they are Literal or Figurative, he says, * *If the Expression contains any Precept, either concerning a wicked and immoral Action that is to be avoided, or an useful and beneficent Act that is to be put in Execution, it is not Figurative: But, if it seems to command any wicked or immoral Act, or forbid a beneficent or useful one, then it is certainly*

* Si præceptiva Locutio est, aut Flagitium aut Facinus vetans; aut utilitatem, aut Beneficentiam jubens, non est Figurata. Si autem Flagitium, aut Facinus videtur Jubere; aut utilitatem aut Beneficentiam vetare, Figurata est. Nisi Manducaveritis, inquit, carnem filii hominis & sanguinem biberitis, non habetis vitam in vobis: Facinus vel Flagitium videtur Jubere: Figurata est Ergo, præcipiens Passioni Domini esse communicandum, & suaviter, atq; utiliter recondendum in memoria quod pro nobis Caro ejus Crucifixa, & vulnerata sit. Aug: Tom. 2. De Doctr: Christ: l. iii. c. 16.

certainly *Figurative*. For Example, that Text of Scripture which says, EXCEPT YOU EAT THE FLESH OF THE SON OF MAN, AND DRINK HIS BLOOD, YE HAVE NO LIFE IN YOU: As it seems to command a wicked and immoral Action, must be interpreted figuratively. And therefore this Expression ought to be looked upon as a figurative one, instructing us that we are to communicate in the Passion of our Lord; and affectionately and devoutly to BEAR IN REMEMBRANCE, that his Flesh was crucified and wounded for us. Now after this Declaration, it would certainly be very unfair in any Author whatsoever to quote any Expression out of St. *Augustine*, to support the literal Interpretation of the Words in the Institution of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. But suppose that this Quotation out of St. *Augustine* was not to be met with, and that there had been several Expressions found in his Works, which would countenance the Doctrine of the real Presence, what has this to do with *Transubstantiation*? Nothing at all. The Proofs which are produced by the *Romanists* out of the Primitive Fathers to prove the real Presence, favour indeed the Doctrine of *Consubstantiation*, but cannot be the least Proof for the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*; unless they can also prove the Transubstantiation of the Substance of the Bread into the Substance of the Body of *Christ*. Which may be pronounced impossible to be done. Nay, indeed, the Opinion of the most ancient Fathers was so much to the contrary, that * *Origen* positively says, when speaking of the Sacrament of the Eucharist: That *the Bread which is sanctified by the Word of God, as to the MATTER of it, goes into the Belly and is cast out on the Dungbill*. And, it was not till very lately, that is, within this 5 or 600 Years, that ever the contrary Doctrine got any Footing in the Christian Church. And, therefore, in order to satisfy our Author's Curiosity, and answer his Queries; *When did the Change happen? Who were the Authors of it?* The Bishop positively says, that *this Change happened in the Year of our Lord 1215, at the fourth general Lateran Council*, and he defies all Mankind to prove, that ever it was established by any Council, till that Time. Nor, indeed, was it possible; because it was then so Novel a Doctrine, that it was but towards the latter End of the preceding Century, that a Name was found out for it. And to prove this, the same Authority shall be made use of, that was before with regard to the Celibacy of the Clergy: Because he cannot be suspected of being a partial Evidence.

* *Origen*, in *Mat.* 15.

dence. And that is the famous *Dupin*, Doctor of the *Sorbon* in *Paris*, who, in the Life of *Peter Celles*, Bishop of *Chartres*, who lived in the 12th Century, has these Words : *In his eighth Sermon on the Lord's Supper, we find the Term of Transubstiation, which is also in Stephen, Bishop of Autun, who lived in the same Century : And indeed those two Authors are the first who made use of it.*

WITH regard to the Doctrine of *Communion in one Kind*, this Author makes no manner of Answer to the *Reply*, but seems to give the Point entirely up ; only he * denies his having referred his Reader to the original Institution of this Sacrament, as mentioned by *St. Matthew*, in order to justify the Communion under one Kind. Now the Truth of the Fact is, that the Replier, in reasoning about the Doctrine of Communion in one Kind, recollected that this Author, when speaking of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, had, in his 23d Page, referred his Reader to the original Institution, as related by *St. Matthew* ; the Replier therefore begins his Paragraph, with saying, This Author, besides, refers his Reader to the original Institution, as mentioned by *St. Matthew* ; but does not add, as this Author seems to insinuate, in order to justify the Communion under one Kind. But what if this Author had quoted the original Institution, as mentioned by *St. Matthew* ? Where would be the great Harm of it ? Surely, if Communion under one Kind is to be vindicated, the proper Place to go to, for the Vindication of it, is the original Institution. And the Bishop cannot conceive any Reason, why this Author should be so eager in denying his Reference to that Text, but that which is assigned by *Don Queredo* for a Pickpocket's denying his Fingers-ends at the Resurrection ; because they would be Proof against him at the Day of Judgment.

This Author's Excuse for demanding Bishop *Usher's* Demonstrations to have been inserted, is mere trifling. For he compares a particular short Treatise, written on a particular Subject, to the Bible ; which every body ought to know is fraught with great Variety of Subjects. And whereas this Author says, if, † in a *Dispute on any Subject*, you quote the Bible to support your Cause ; unless you mention the Book, the Chapter, the Words, you pretend to be in your Favour, your Appeal to the Bible in general, will only serve to expose you to the adverse Party's Banter. That is, according to the Nature of the Subject about which the Dispute has arisen. For if the Dispute should be about Revelation

in

* *Rejoin*, p. 23. † *Rejoin*. p. 24.

in general, the Bible at large may be quoted as an Instance thereof. Bishop *Usher's* Book is a Collection of Quotations, put together with all the Brevity imaginable, to demonstrate, that *the Religion professed by the antient Irish, was the same in Substance with that which is now established by the publick Authority in Ireland.* And as the Bishop of *Cork*, in that Part of his *Pastoral Letter*, where he refers to Bishop *Usher*, was defending Protestantism in general, and not any particular Branch of it, he quoted this Treatise of Bishop *Usher's*, as sufficient to prove, that the Doctrines of Protestantism in general, were publickly professed before either *Luther* or *Calvin*. And it was almost impossible for him to do Justice to that learned Author, without referring to the whole Book.

BUT now we come to the famous Point of the Supremacy, which this Author says, * *Is an Article of the greatest Importance; and that it will not be amiss here to insert a Piece lately dress'd, upon that Head, for the Satisfaction of that very inquisitive Protestant Gentleman, whose Address to the Clergy of his own Communion is prefixed to the brief Account of the Vaudois.* As our Author thinks this Subject a very important one, so it seems that he imagines the Defence of it, to which he refers, to be a very important one also; because he thinks it so well worth the transcribing, and giving a second Time to the Publick. This Part of his Treatise, therefore, comes next under Consideration: † And the first Appearance of an Argument that is produced in it, is because Christ made his Church *one Body, one Kingdom, one Sheepfold*; therefore Jesus Christ has appointed some particular Person to be his Vicar on Earth, to be the supreme and spiritual Monarch of his whole Church; which Monarch, which visible Head, which chief Pastor, under Jesus Christ, is Peter? Was ever such an Argument made use of before? Because the Church is *One*, therefore it must have *Two* Heads. For how often, in Scripture, is Christ called the Head of his Body, the Church? And unless this Author will make two Churches of Christ instead of *One*, and separate the Church of Christ in Heaven, from that on Earth; and declare his Disbelief of the Communion of Saints in Heaven, with the Saints on Earth, he ought not to insist upon this *One Body* having *Two* Heads. But let us proceed to consider his Proofs for this from the Scriptures, which he affirms to have proceeded || *out of the sacred Mouth of Jesus Christ.*

And

* *Rej.* p. 24. † *Rej.* p. 25. || *Rej.* p. 25.

And these we shall find in Page 26. to be: * *Now the Names of the twelve Apostles are these; the first, Simon, who is called Peter, &c.* where it is to be observed, in the first Place, that these Words are by no means the Words of our Saviour, but of the Evangelist: And, secondly, that if these Words had proceeded from our Saviour's own Mouth, they would prove nothing at all, but that *Peter* was one of the Apostles. For suppose a List of a Company of Soldiers who had behaved well, or that were designed for any particular Service, was given in by their Officer, or was delivered down by some Historian to Posterity, certain it is, that some one of them must be named first, and placed at the Head of the List. But would any one of common Sense argue from thence, that this first Man in the List must be a superior Officer to the rest?

THE next Text is, that famous one of *Mat. xvi. 18, 19. Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build my Church, and the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it: And unto thee I will give the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven.* The Bishop thought the Replier would have prevented this Author from making use of this Text, by pointing out to him in the Reply, that this Declaration of our Saviour's was spoken in the future Tense, *I will give*: And by defying this Author to shew, that ever our Saviour fulfilled this Promise to *Peter*, but, at the same time, that he gave the Keys of his Church to the rest of the Apostles also; which is so remarkably true, that when *St. Matthew* relates the History of our Saviour's empowering his Apostles to make Disciples among the Gentiles as well as the Jews, he particularly specifies, that *the Eleven* were all present. † *Then the Eleven went away into Galilee, into a Mountain, where Jesus had appointed them. And when they saw him, they worshipped him; but some doubted. And Jesus came, and spake unto them, saying, All Power is given unto me in Heaven and in Earth. Go ye, therefore, teach all Nations, baptizing, &c.* Here our Saviour gives the Keys of his Church equally to *all the Eleven*, and empowers them equally to open the Doors of Salvation unto all Nations. And if our Saviour gave any Keys in particular to *St. Peter*, before this Time, they could only be the Keys of the Circumcision, but not of the Uncircumcision: For not having received *all Power* before this, the Door of Salvation to the Gentiles had never before been opened, since the last time that our Saviour sent forth these very Apostles

* *Mat. x. 2.*† *Mat. xxviii. 16.*

Apostles, to preach the Gospel, during his Life, their Commission was confined to the lost Sheep of the House of Israel. Go not, says he, into the Way of the Gentiles; and into any City of the Samaritans enter not. Mat. x. 5.

WITH regard to the Conversation which our Saviour had with St. Peter, mentioned above, the Bishop freely acknowledges, that our Saviour, in his Answer, applied himself principally to St. Peter; because St. Peter alone had answered the Question, which our Saviour had put to the Apostles in general. And he saith unto them, *But whom say ye that I am?* And Simon Peter answered, and said, *Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God.* And Jesus answered, and said unto him, *Blessed art thou Simon Barjona; for Flesh and Blood hath not revealed this unto thee, but my Father which is in Heaven.* And I say also unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build my Church, and the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it. Now, What is the Rock upon which our Saviour built his Church? Was it Peter alone, and not the rest of the Apostles? No! for, if St. Paul says true, we * are built upon the Foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, and not upon † Peter alone. But what is this Foundation that was laid by the Apostles and Prophets? Why this also we shall find explained by St. Paul, where he says, || Other Foundation can no Man lay, than that is laid, which is § JESUS THE CHRIST. The Rock, therefore, upon which our Saviour declares he will build his Church, must be the Confession of Faith, which Peter had before pronounced, that Jesus was the Christ: Thou art, says he, Christ, the Son of the living God. Which Doctrine is, indeed, the true and the only Foundation of all that Christian Faith, which was laid by the Prophets, and built upon by the Apostles.

BUT to invalidate this Argument, and to shew, that the ** Power only of Apostleship was given to the eleven Disciples after our Saviour's Resurrection, but not the Power of Jurisdiction and Authority, unless subordinate to that he promised to St. Peter with the Keys; our Author produces that Text of Job. xxi. 15, 16, 17. where our Saviour, speaking to Peter, says, *Feed my Sheep*; which Text this Author insists much upon being addressed to Peter alone. Now as this seems to be our Author's Sheet Anchor, let us try the Strength of its Hold; and I believe we shall, upon Enquiry, soon find it lodged in

E

nothing

* Eph. ii. 20. † Rej. p. 26, 27. || 1 Cor. iii. 11. § *Ἰησοῦς ὁ χριστός*. ** Rej. p. 26, 27.

nothing but Slutch and Mud. When our Saviour promised the Keys to St. Peter, he adds, * *And whatsoever thou shalt bind on Earth, shall be bound in Heaven: And whatsoever thou shalt loose on Earth, shall be loosed in Heaven.* But according to St. John, it was not till after our Saviour's Resurrection, that this Power was actually given by our Saviour, either to St. Peter, or to any of the Apostles; but † *when the Doors were shut where the Disciples were assembled, for fear of the Jews, came Jesus, and stood in the Midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you: As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whosoever Sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever Sins ye retain, they are retained.* So that hitherto we find no Foundation for that Distinction between the *Apostleship* and *Jurisdiction* which this Author hath been pleased to insist upon. But, says he, the Promise of the Keys was fulfilled in that personal Commission that he (Christ) gave him (Peter) alone of feeding his Lambs and Sheep. Now it seems the most surprising thing in the World, to find a Person, who pretends to the least degree of common Understanding, producing this Text to prove a Commission, or Power given in these Words distinct from, and superior to that of *Apostleship*. The Office of being a *Pastor* or Shepherd in the Church, instead of being the highest, is reckoned among one of the lowest Offices in the Christian Ministry, by St. Paul: For, says he, in his Epistle to the || *Ephesians*, Christ gave some Apostles, and some Prophets; and some Evangelists, and some Pastors and Teachers. Now the Word *Pastor*, literally, signifies one that feedeth Sheep or Lambs. And if we enquire into the Context, and consider the whole Purport of our Saviour's Discourse, we shall find, that it was rather a Distrust, which our Saviour had in himself of St. Peter's Conduct, than a conferring of any additional Power, that was the Occasion of these Words. The Bishop declares himself far from being inclined to derogate from the Merit of St. Peter, or blemish his Character in the least; but if there be any Opinion to be formed in general of St. Peter's natural Temper, and Disposition of Mind, from the Hints given about him in the Scriptures of the *New Testament*: It is this, that he was an honest, well-meaning Man, willing and quick to undertake a virtuous or good Action, but timorous in the Execution. Thus we find, that when our

Saviour

* *Mat. xvi. 19.* † *Job. xx. 19.* || *Eph. iv. 11.*

Saviour was seen by his * Disciples walking on the Sea, *Peter* was the first who answered him, and said, *Lord, if it be thou, bid me come unto thee on the Water.* And he said, *Come.* And when *Peter* was come down out of the Ship, he walked on the Water to go to *Jesus*: But when he saw the Wind boisterous he was afraid; and beginning to sink, he cried, saying, *Lord, save me.* In like manner, when our Saviour asked his Disciples, saying, † Whom say ye that I am? *Peter* was the Person who answered for the rest, and said, *Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God.* But when our Saviour began to tell them, how that ‖ he must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the chief Priests, and Scribes, and be killed, and be raised again the third Day. Then *Peter* took him, and began to rebuke him, saying, *Be it far from thee, Lord; this shall not be unto thee.* Here his Fears began to work upon him; and therefore *Jesus* said unto *Peter*, *Get thee behind me, Satan, thou art an Offence unto me: for thou savourest not the Things which be of God, but those that be of Men.* When our Saviour, before his Crucifixion, told his Disciples, § That they should all be offended, because of him that Night, it was ** *Peter* who answered, and said unto him, *Though all Men should be offended because of thee, yet will I never be offended.—Though I should die with thee, yet will I not deny thee.* Yet every body knows, when it came to the Trial, when Danger stared him in the Face, how soon he was offended, and with what Vehemence he denied him. And in the Contest between St. *Peter* and St. *Paul*, about eating with the Gentiles, St. *Paul* observes, †† That before certain Persons came from James, *Peter* did eat with the Gentiles: but when they were come, he withdrew, and separated himself, FEARING them which were of the Circumcision. And in this Place, which is now under Consideration, our Saviour's Discourse with *Peter*, about feeding his Lambs and his Sheep, seems rather designed to strengthen St. *Peter*, and to give him new Courage, than to give him any new Jurisdiction: For otherwise, Why should *Peter* be ‖‖ grieved, at our Saviour's saying, the third time, *Simon, Son of Jonas, lovest thou me?* were it not that he was sensible, when our Saviour asked him that Question so often, and bid him as often feed his Sheep, that it looked as if our Saviour was diffident of his Courage, and suspected his Conduct in a Time of Adversity. And by consider-

E 2

ing

* Mat. xiv. 26. † Mat. xvi. 15. ‖ Mat. xvi. 21. § Mat. xxvi. 31.
 ** Mat. xxvi. 32, 35. †† Gal. ii. 12. ‖‖ Job. xxi. 17.

ing the whole Context together, it seems more probable, that our Saviour took this Method to prepare him for bearing what was to befall him at last, and to strengthen him against the Day of Trial, than to make him a Ruler over his Brethren. For otherwise it would have been much more proper to have said, govern and direct my Shepherds, than feed my Sheep.

BUT there remains one Text of Scripture not yet taken Notice of, which is quoted by this Author to prove the Jurisdiction which was given by Christ to St. *Peter*, over the rest of the Apostles, when our Saviour said unto him, * *Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired you, that he may sift you as Wheat : but I have prayed for thee, THAT THY FAITH MAY FAIL NOT ; and thou converted once, strengthen thy Brethren.* This Speech was made by our Saviour to St. *Peter*, at the same time that he told him, that the † Cock should not crow that Day, before he should thrice deny that he knew him : And therefore our Saviour, who knew the Goodness of *Peter's* Intentions, notwithstanding the Weakness of his Courage, recommends it to him, that after he had recovered himself from his Fright, and recollected himself, and repented of his Conduct, he would contribute to help the rest of his Brethren, who were dispersed, and possibly frightened as well as St. *Peter*, to recover from their Doubtfulness and Despair. But what Jurisdiction does this give him over his Brethren ? Is it not the Duty of every good Man, when he has fallen, and is risen out of the Dirt, to endeavour to help up those who were in the same Circumstances with himself ? And the Bishop owns himself puzzled to find out the Reason why this Author has printed those Words of the Text, *That thy Faith may fail not*, in a different Character from the rest ; but conjectures, that it was done to insinuate to the unwary Reader, an Opinion of the Infallibility of St. *Peter*, and of his Successors in the See of *Rome* : Because Christ declares, that he had prayed, that *Peter's* Faith might not fail ; and every Christian knows, that Christ's Prayers will not fail of Success. But the Matter of Fact is, that *Peter's* Faith did fail, for it was after this, that he denied Christ over and over again ; and being further pressed, *began to curse and to swear, saying, I know not the Man.* And the Bishop mentions this only to put our Author, and his Friends, in mind of the Nature of the prophetic Style in the Scriptures, which is not always to be interpreted strictly and literally ;
for

* *Lu.* xxii. 31, 32.

† *Lu.* xxii. 34.

for though *Peter's* Faith failed him for a while, yet having recovered himself, and repented, he is in the prophetic Style said *not to fail*. In like manner, when God sent a Message to *David* by *Nathan* the Prophet, saying, *† Moreover I will appoint a Place for my People of Israel, and will plant them, that they may dwell in a Place of their own, and MOVE NO MORE: neither shall the Children of Wickedness AFFLICT THEM ANY MORE, as before Time*. We are not to understand by this, that during the Continuance of the Jewish States, the *Israelites* should never be moved out of their Country, nor their Temple destroyed; but, that they should *not be utterly removed*, so as not to be restored again. For it was after this, that the Babylonish Captivity happened, when the Temple was destroyed, and the Inhabitants of *Jerusalem* were moved out of the Land for seventy Years. So also in the New Testament, when our Saviour declares, that the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against his Church, it is not to be apprehended, that Heresies shall not prevail in it for a Time; for *St. Paul* says, *§ there must be Heresies, that they which are approved may be made manifest*. And I trust in God that the Faith of the Church of *Rome* shall be like *St. Peter's* Faith, which though it hath *|| stumbled*, yet shall not fall; and though it hath failed yet shall recover itself, and shall not fail for ever.

BUT now we come to Matters of Fact. For, says our * Author, *If we further consult the Scriptures, we find an undeniable confirmation of St. Peter's Superiority over the rest of the Apostles in the Execution of his Office*. This indeed is coming close to the Point, and now let us see how our Author performs his Promise, when he proceeds and says, *Thus he (Peter) officiated as supreme Pastor when he ||| ordered another Apostle to be chosen instead of Judas*. But if we consult the Scriptures upon this Head, we shall find that it was not *Peter*, but the Assembly of Apostles, who appointed two, *Joseph* called *Barsabas*, who was surnamed *Justus* and *Matthias*. And they prayed, and said, *Thou Lord which knowest the Hearts of all Men, shew whether of these two thou hast chosen; that he may take Part of this Ministry and Apostleship, from whence Judas by Transgression fell, that he might go to his own Place*. And THEY gave forth THEIR Lots; and the Lot fell upon *Matthias*, and he was numbred among the eleven Apostles. Now does this Conduct show any thing like a Superiority in *St. Peter*? or can there be a more levelling Method of

† 2 Sam. vii. 10. § 1 Cor. xi. 19. || Rom. xi. 11. * p. 27. ||| A.B. i. 15.

of chusing any Thing than choosin^g of it by Lot? *Peter* indeed stood up and spoke in the Assembly, and his Speech was approved of by the rest of the Apostles, but surely every Body that speaks in an Assembly is not therefore the President. Or though appointed President or Chairman of the Assembly, he might have no Authority over the rest, but what was put into his Hands for that Time by his Equals.

BUT, continues our Author, § *After the Descent of the Holy Ghost, he first preached the Gospel to the Jews, and converted in that first Sermon three thousand of them.* Now if the Scriptures say what is true, this Author says what is false. For before *Peter's* Sermon is mentioned, it is said that in the Room where the Apostles were assembled || there appeared cloven Tongues like as of Fire, and it sat upon each of them: And they were ALL filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other Tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance: §§ *The wonderful Works of Christ.* And it was not till after this, when some that were present who did not understand their variety of Languages, ++ *Mocking said, these Men are full of new Wine;* that St. *Peter's* Speech is recorded, which begins accordingly, ** *Ye Men of Judea, and all ye that dwell at Jerusalem, be this known unto you, and hearken to my Words: For these are not drunken, &c.* But what if he had been the first after our Saviour's Death, that had preached the Gospel of Christ to the Jews? What Jurisdiction would this have given him over the rest of the Apostles? It might have given him the ||| *right of Apostleship* over those he converted: But surely it could not confer any manner of Jurisdiction, as distinct from that of Apostleship, either over them, or any Body else.

AGAIN, our Author says, *He (Peter) first of all preached the same Gospel to the Gentiles.* What then? Almighty God had a Mind to shew a particular Favour to *Cornelius*, a devout, or profelyted Gentile, who lived at *Cæsarea*; and at that Time *Peter* happened to be at *Joppa*, a neighbouring Town; and God was pleased to direct *Cornelius* to send to *Peter*; and to order *Peter* to go to *Cornelius*, to preach the Gospel unto him. But what does this prove? What Jurisdiction is there here exercised over the rest of the Apostles, as distinct from the Power of Apostleship? according to this * Author's own notable Distinction. If the Gentiles were to be called in, some Body must have been the first Preacher to them; but what Connexion is there between this and exercising Jurisdiction over the Apostles? St. *Paul* was the first

§ *Rej. p. 27.* || *Act. ii. 3.* §§ *v. 11.* ++ *v. 13.* ** *v. 14.* ||| *1 Cor. ix. 1.* * *Rej. p. 27.*

first who preached the Gospel to the Idolatrous Gentiles, but what then? Did any Man of common Sense ever pretend to argue from thence for his Supremacy over the Apostles? It gave him a Right, indeed, as he was appointed thereunto by Christ, to style himself *The Apostle of the Gentiles*, but cannot possibly be a Proof of his having exercised any *Jurisdiction* over the rest of the Apostles.

BUT our Author says also, that *He (Peter) wrought the first Miracle in Testimony of the Christian Faith*. And to prove this, he quotes Acts iii. 6. But if this Author had given himself leave to have read the preceding Chapter, he would have found, that before this, upon the Conversion of the three thousand, it is there said, that § *many Wonders and Signs were done by the Apostles*. But what if *Peter* had been the first? Is there any more Force in this Argument than there is in the foregoing ones, which prove nothing at all to the Purpose?

BUT our Author comes in the last Place to prove the Jurisdiction of *Peter* over the Apostles, by asserting, *that Peter || presided at the Apostles Council held in Jerusalem, where he spake first, and pronounced the Decree*. Here are three Things asserted. 1st, *that Peter presided*. 2dly, *that he spake first*. And 3dly, *that he pronounced the Decree*. Each of which Assertions is as far from Truth, as Hell is far from Heaven. As to the Presidency of *St. Peter* in that Assembly; the Replyer to this Author's former Answer, manifestly shewed, that it was *James*, the then Bishop of *Jerusalem*, who presided in that Council held at *Jerusalem*, which indeed appears from the whole Story, as related Acts 15. Nor was *Peter* either the first, or last, who spoke in the Debate, for it is there positively said, that *Peter* did not rise up to speak till † *after there had been much debating*. And when *Peter* had done, than †† *James* rose up, and takes Notice of *Peter's* Speech, and closes the Debate, and pronounces the Decree in these remarkable Words. ||| *Wherefore MY SENTENCE is, that we trouble not them, which from among the Gentiles are turned to God: But that we write unto them that they abstain from Pollutions of Idols, and from Fornication, and from Things strangled, and from Blood*. How ought so corrupt an Author to be treated? The Chastisement which *Solomon* appoints * *for the back of him that is void of Understanding*, would be too gentle a Correction for him. The Bishop owns himself tired with detecting his

§ *Act. ii. 24.* || *Rej. p. 27.* † *Act. xv. 7.* †† *Act. xv. 13.* ||| *Act. xv. 19.*
* *Prov. x. 13.*

his Untruths and his false Quotations, and exposing the fallacy of his Arguments; and acknowledges himself to be in the Condition of a Man that is fatigued with fighting in his Sleep, or as the common Expression is *fighting with a Shadow*. Since all the Arguments, made use of by this Author, are only so many Apparitions, towards which, when the Bishop had approached, and come within reach of a blow, the Argument vanished, and he had nothing to combat with but Air.

THUS having considered the Spiritual Power of the Pope, we now come to his Temporal. Which this Author declares, § *was entirely owing to the Piety and Liberality of the Christian Princes, particularly the most Christian Monarchs of France*. And here the Bishop acknowledges that this Author speaks some Truth for once, and that the Temporal Power of the Pope was owing to Christian Princes, and particularly to the most Christian Monarchs of *France*. But denies that this was owing either to their Piety or Liberality. For the Bishop does not think it either a pious or a liberal Act to rob *Paul* to give to *Peter*. And the Bishop cannot conceive what Right the most Christian Monarchs of *France* had to dispose of the *Emperor's* Dominions in *Italy*, and give them to the Pope. The Kings of *France*, from the rise of that Kingdom, have been jealous of the Power of the *Empire*, and were glad to take the Part of a saucy, proud, ambitious, rebellious Ecclesiastick, to set him up, and support him against his rightful and lawful Sovereign. And it was with a political View, but far from a pious one, that the most Christian Monarchs of *France* took the Opportunity of troublesome Times in the *Empire*, to carry their Arms into *Italy*, and dismember the Imperial Dominions of those Territories, which they so liberally and piously conferred on the Pope.

BUT why is the Piety and Liberality of the most Christian Monarchs of *France* towards the Pope, taken such particular Notice of by this Author, as to be inserted in Italick Characters? In answer to which, it is to be observed, that this Part of the *Rejoinder* is taken out of the Treatise entitled, *A brief historical Account of the Vaudois*, which Paper was written at a Time when the Arms of *France* were in their Splendor, and threatned the Liberties of *Europe*; and though at present it hath pleased God, in some Measure, to abate their Pride, and confound their Devices, yet if Things should take a different Turn, which God forbid, the Bishop cannot help thinking that these Words seem

seem again inserted to engage the Affections of the *Irish* Papists, and preserve them from being alienated from the Interest of the Court of *France*.

AND now this Author comes to define what he means by the *Supremacy* of the Pope, which says he, || *consists in a Special Right of a general Inspection and Correction, that the Bishop of Rome has with Regard to Religion, over all the faithful who compose the Church of Christ, and that not to tyrannize but to serve the Spouse of Christ, &c.* The Bishop of *Corke* cannot but observe, that this Author explains himself with great *Tenderness* and *Delicacy* upon this Subject; he seems unwilling to speak out; he is afraid of burning his Fingers, and yet reserves Fire enough, under the Embers of a seeming Moderation, to blow up into a Blaze whenever he thinks proper. For, says he, the Supremacy of the Pope consists in a Special Right of Inspection and Correction, that the Bishop of *Rome* has, with regard to Religion, over all the Faithful. By which Words of *Inspection and Correction* must be understood not only the Power of *Apostleship* over the inferior Clergy and Laity within his Province of *Rome*, § but of *Jurisdiction* over all the Faithful with regard to Religion; that is not only over all the Pastors and Bishops, but also over all the Princes who profess Christianity. And how far this Expression *with regard to Religion* may be extended, this Author manifestly shews in the Preface to his *Rejoinder*, where he supports the Independency of the Church upon the State, by exempting the Clergy from all Jurisdiction but that of their *Church Superiors*.

EVERY Body, who is the least acquainted with the History of *England*, knows what Disturbances were raised upon this Account in the Affair of *Thomas Becket*; and the History of the Conduct of the Pope, with Reference to King *John*, is so well known, as to need no Aggravation. In which Dispute the Pope carried his *Regard to Religion* so far, as to collect Taxes in *England* by Virtue of his Papal Authority; and obliged the King to resign his Crown into his Hands, and become a Tributary Prince to the See of *Rome*. But, to convince this Author that the Bishop has no Desire to inflame the Debate, he is willing at present to wave this Part of the Question; and to attend him in those Instances of the Supremacy, which this Author chuses to produce, in that Part of his Treatise, which he is pleased to entitle *the Bishop of Rome's Supremacy acknowledged by the Primitive Church*.

F

And

And to prove this, our Author produces several Councils. And speaking of the Council of *Chalcedon*, which was held in the Year 451, he says that * *those Persons who gave Occasion to call this Council, and their Accusers equally applied to St. Leo then Bishop of Rome, as to their common Father and Superior. That the Emperors then reigning, Theodosius the younger first, and after his Death, which happened about that Time, Valentinian and Marcian made their Addresses to the Pope, representing the Necessity of calling a general Council—† That the Pope's Legates, two Bishops, and one Priest, took without the least Opposition the first Place, and Presided in that Council, held out of the Bounds of Europe.— And that they opened the Council in the Pope's Name, &c.—* As this Author does not produce his Proofs, for these Assertions, the Bishop cannot say, whether the Quotations he produces are picked up out of the Gleanings of some old Controversial Writings, or are the fictitious Productions of his own Brain. But to prove that both they, and the Assertions founded thereon, are entirely false, the Bishop will make use of the same Authority he has already so often quoted for being an unexceptionable Evidence; and that is, the famous Dr. *Dupin* who lived and died in the Communion of the Church of *Rome*, and we shall find, by consulting this learned Writer, that there is not one Word of Truth in any thing that our Author asserts. For Mr. *Dupin* says, † that the two Persons, who gave Occasion to the calling of this Council, were *Eutyches*, a Priest and Abbot of the Monastery of *Constantinople*, and *Eusebius*, Bishop of *Dorylaeum*, who was supported by *Flavian* Bishop of *Constantinople*. Which *Eutyches* had been condemned in a Council, called at *Constantinople*, as being a Favourer of the *Nestorian* Heresy. Upon which *Eutyches* wrote to Pope *Leo*, to desire § *he would give his JUDGMENT about the Point in Question.* ** But *Eutyches*, says *Dupin*, did not content himself with writing to the Pope, he besought the Emperor to call a general Council. Which the Emperor resolved to do, and in the mean time to assemble the Bishops residing in *Constantinople*, to examine the Acts of the preceding Council. †† And *Patricius Florentinus* being nominated by the Emperor, held the chief Place in it as Judge: But nothing was done in this Council. In the mean time several Letters passed between Pope *Leo*, and *Flavian* Bishop of *Constantinople* about this Affair. For *Leo* having

* *Rejoin.* p. 37. † Page 38. ‖ *Dup. Eccles. Hist. English Ed. Cent. 5. p. 219.*
§ Page 222. ** Page 223. †† Page 221, 223.

having written to *Flavian* in Favour of *Eutyches*, *Flavian* in return sent him a Copy of the Acts of the Council of *Constantinople*; and in a second Letter prays him, || to make known the Condemnation of *Eutyches*, TO ALL THE BISHOPS SUBJECT TO THE SEE OF ROME, for Fear least any one not being informed of it, should write to him or communicate with him. The Pope, says *Dupin*, was of Opinion at first as well as *Flavian*, that it was not necessary to call a general Council, at least in the East, and to prevent it prayed *Theodosius* to call one in Italy; but before the Emperor had received this Letter, he had appointed a Council to meet at *Ephesus*, at the humble Request of *Dioscorus* Bishop of *Alexandria*, for the Re-examination of the Business of *Eutyches*. *Leo* having Notice of it, and § being summoned to it, as other Bishops were, nominated three Legates, to whom he gave several Letters. In the first of which was drawn up a Confession of Faith. In the second, he abuses *Eutyches* and his Doctrine. The third was directed to the Emperor, mentioning that *Eutyches* was apparently in an Error. The fourth was to the Empress *Pulcheria*, commending her Zeal, and complaining that the Emperor had appointed the Council upon too short Notice, because the Bishops of Italy had not sufficient time to prepare for, and finish such a Journey. The fifth was directed to the Abbots of *Constantinople*, declaring his Sentiments to them. And the sixth was to the Council itself; exhorting the Fathers of the Council to suppress the Error.

THE Emperor likewise wrote several Letters; the seventh of which is a ** Letter to *Dioscorus*, in which he gives him the Precedence of the Bishops, and the chief Authority in the Council.

THIS Council met Aug. 8. 449. It was made up of one hundred and thirty Bishops. †† *Dioscorus* Bishop of *Alexandria* was President of it, by the Emperor's Order; and the Legates of the Pope held the second Place in it.

WHEN the chief Notary, says *Dupin*, had opened the Council, by declaring to the Bishops, that the EMPEROR had caused them to meet to examine a Controversy of Faith, disputed between *Flavian* and *Eutyches*, and had read the Emperor's Letter for calling of the Council; then the Legate made Excuses for Pope *Leo*, that he did not come in Person to the Council, as he had been desired by the Emperor, because

F 2

|| *Dup. Eccles. Hist. English Ed. Cent. 5. p. 224.*
 †† Page 226.

§ Page 224.

** Page 225.

cause there was no Precedent that it had ever been done in any Council. He then required them to receive and read the Pope's Letter, in which he explained the Doctrine of the Church, *but, says Mr. Dupin, they did not read this Letter, but the Emperor's.* In short, *Eutyches* was acquitted. Upon which the Pope wrote to the Emperor *Theodosius*, in his own and his Brethren's Name, || that the Council which *he* had caused to be called at *Epbefus*, had depraved the Purity of the Faith, and Discipline of the Church: And says, *that all the Churches, and all the Western Bishops did implore him with Tears and Sighs, that since the Legates of the Holy See had opposed it, and Flavian had presented an Appeal, his Majesty would call a general Council in Italy, which might either wholly remove or mitigate the Causes of the Discontent.* But, says *Dupin*, He could never get a Council called while *Theodosius* lived.

UPON the Death of *Theodosius*, *Marcian* who succeeded him, in the Year 450, entered upon the Throne with different Sentiments, because *Pulcheria*, the Sister of *Theodosius*, by whose Marriage he was advanced to that Dignity, had a great Veneration for the Bishops of *Rome*. So that the Emperor *Marcian* and Pope *Leo* were both of the same Mind as to the calling of a Council; § but *Leo* desired it might meet in *Italy*; whereas the Emperor peremptorily resolved it should be in the East. And accordingly HE APPOINTED one at *Nice* in *Bitaynia* Sept. 1, 451, to which the Pope sent his Legates, and wrote a Letter to the Bishops of the Council, to excuse himself from not coming to the Council, by reason of the Custom. That is, the Want of a Precedent.

ON the first of September, which was the Day appointed for the Beginning of the Council, several Bishops came to *Nice*, and having staid there some Days, and hearing nothing from the Emperor, they wrote to him, to suffer the Council to begin. To which the Emperor returned them this Answer, that the Legates of the Pope having desired that he should be there in Person, and that his Affairs having not hitherto suffered him, nor yet permitting him to go to *Nice*, he desired them to come to *Chalcedon*, where they should hold a Council.

ACCORDINGLY, this Council was held in the great Church of *St. Euphemia* in *Chalcedon*, Oct. 8, Ann. 451: * The Emperor's commissioned Officers, and the Counsellors of State being present, WHO WERE TO DIRECT ALL THEIR MOTIONS; and were set in the Middle of the Council,

Council, near the Rails of the Altar. On the left Hand were the Pope's Legates, next to them *Anatolius* Bishop of *Constantinople*, &c. But, upon the right Hand were *Dioscorus* Bishop of *Alexandria*, and *Juvenal* Bishop of *Jerusalem*, &c.

UPON hearing of the Cause, the *Commissioners*, says *Dupin*, concluded that *Eutyches* had been falsely acquitted, and that *Dioscorus* Bishop of *Alexandria*, who had presided in the Council of *Ephesus*, should be declared unworthy of his Episcopal Office. The Commissioners then recommended it to the Bishops, to draw up a Confession of Faith. Upon which the Bishops having met *October 13*, † *without the Commissioners*, to draw up a Confession of Faith, it was only in that private Assembly, that the Pope's Legates are said to have made that Speech, which is quoted by the Author of the *Rejoinder*, wherein the Pope's Legates propote the Form of Deposition of *Dioscorus* to be in these Words: § *Leo Archbishop of old Rome, doth by us, and by the Synod, with the Authority of St. Peter, who is the Rock and Foundation of the Church, and the Ground of Faith, depose him from his Episcopal Authority.*

AND when the Confession of Faith was drawn up and agreed upon, then || *November 25*, the *Emperor Marcian* came in Person to the Council, and required the Synod to approve some Regulations, which he had made, and which he thought more for the Honour of the Synod to confirm by the Authority of the Bishops, than to make them himself by a Law. Which Regulations were concerning the Conduct of Monks within their Monasteries. Forbidding Clergymen to hold Farms: And Clergymen to remove from one Church to another, without Leave of their Bishop. Which the Bishops approving of, made several Canons suitable thereto. And it was in the 17th Canon of this very Council, that it was decreed, * *That the Churches or Parishes should remain under the Jurisdiction of those Bishops who are in Possession of them, especially if they have been so for thirty Years past; but, if within thirty Years there have been any Disputes about them, it shall be permitted to refer themselves to the Provincial Synod: Or, if it be a Bishop who is injured by his Metropolitan, he may have Recourse to the Patriarch of his Diocese, or to the Bishop of Constantinople. Where it is to be observed, that the Bishop of Constantinople, and not the Bishop of Rome, is here placed at the Head of the Christian Church, in this Council where the Pope's Legates were present; and that the Bishop of Rome is only considered upon a Level* with

† *Dup. Eccles. Hist. English Ed. Cent. 5. p. 232. § Page 233. || P. 236. * P. 241.*

with other Patriarchs. The 28th Canon of this same Council grants to the Church of the City of Constantinople, which is called new Rome, the same Privileges with old Rome, because this City is the second City in the World. It also adjudges to it, BESIDES THIS, the Jurisdiction over the Dioceses of Pontus, Asia and Thrace, and over the Churches which are out of the Bounds of the Empire. Which being all ratified by the Emperor, he made two Edicts, says Dupin, to prevent all Opposition to this Council.

AND now the Reader has before him, an Abstract of the Occasion, of the Method of Calling, and of the Meeting of that famous Council of Chalcedon to which the Author of the *Rejoinder* appeals for a Proof of the Pope's Supremacy. And the Bishop leaves it to every unprejudiced Reader's Breast to declare, whether he could desire a more glaring Instance to be produced to the contrary. Can there be a stronger Proof given of the Supremacy of the Emperor, and of all Temporal Princes, even in Disputes about Religion; or a more convincing Testimony, that the sole Power of calling Councils, within the Bounds of the Empire, was in the Emperor alone?

AND whereas this Author § asserts, that the Pope presides in all Councils, either in Person, or by his Legates. This is so far from being true, that the Pope declares he could find *no Precedent* that any of his Predecessors had been personally present in any Council whatsoever; and for this Reason desired, * *because of the Custom*, that he himself might be excused his personal Attendance. Where it is to be observed, that this great Saint, this Saint *Leo*, as he is called by the Church of Rome, had either forgotten that St. Peter made a Speech, and therefore must have been present, in the Council of Jerusalem, mentioned Acts xv. or that he did not look upon St. Peter as one of his Predecessors. And as to the Presidency of the Pope's Legates in Councils, this is so contrary to Truth, that it is manifest neither the Pope, nor any Legate from him was present at that Council, which was held at Constantinople, wherein Eutyches was first condemned; because that Flavian sent to the Pope afterwards a Copy of the Acts of that Council. Nor did Flavian, though Bishop of Constantinople, preside in that Council held at Constantinople; but Florentius Bishop of Sardis, who was nominated by the Emperor's Letter as Commissioner for the Emperor. In the Council held at Ephesus Ann. 449, though the

§ Reg. p. 33. || Council of Eph. Ann. 449. * Council of Chalcedon, Ann. 451.

the Pope's Legates were present, neither they nor the Bishop of *Ephesus* presided, but *Dioscorus* Bishop of *Alexandria*, who was made President of it by the Emperor's Order: And the Pope's Legates held but the second Place. And at the Council of *Chalcedon*, Ann. 451, they sat only in the third Place: For the Emperor's Commissioners, who were to direct all their Motions, were placed in the Middle, and *Dioscorus* Bishop of *Alexandria*, sat on the right Hand, and the Pope's Legates on the left. It likewise appears, that the Emperor *Marcian* did not make his Address to the Pope for calling this Council, as is asserted by our Author, but that the Pope with all the Churches, and the Western Bishops, applied unto him, and implored with Tears and Sighs, that his Majesty would call a Council.

It is also far from being true, that the Council was opened in the Pope's Name, according to this Author's Assertion; since *Dupin*, when he mentions the Method pursued in opening the Council of *Ephesus*, says positively, that it was by the chief Notary's having declared to the Bishops, that the Emperor had caused them to meet, and then read the Emperor's Letter for the calling of the Council. And with regard to the Council of *Chalcedon*, held Ann. 451, he says, that the Emperor's commissioned Officers and Counsellors of State were present; who were to direct all their Motions, and were seated in the Middle of the Council, near the Rails of the Altar; whom he afterwards calls * the Judges.

The next Council which this Author appeals to, is the general Council held at *Ephesus* twenty Years before, in the Year 431. And now let us see what Account the learned *Dupin* gives of this Council, which our Author says † was called by the Pope's Authority, and in which *St. Cyril* presided by a special Commission from the Pope, and in his Name. Now *Dupin* positively declares, that ‖ *Theodosius* the Emperor seeing that a Council was desired by both Sides, and believing it necessary to appease the Troubles of the Church, APPOINTED it at *Ephesus* on Pentecost in the following Year. The Circular Letter which he wrote to invite the chief Metropolitans to it, bears Date November 19, Ann. 430. In which Letter the Emperor says, § that it was HIS DUTY to provide for the Peace and Welfare of the Church, to hinder that it be not troubled with Schisms and Divisions, to provide that Religion be preserved in its Purity, and that the Clergy and Bishops live unblameable Lives. How unfortunate a Creature is the Author of the Rejoinder in his Quotations, to pro-

duce

* Counc. of Chal. Ann 451. p. 231. † Rj. p. 40, 41. ‖ Dup. cent. 5. p. 195. § P. 195.

duce the calling of this Council, as a Proof for the Supremacy of the Pope? But possibly he will deny his having made use of this Council for that End; as he did his having quoted the Original Institution of the Eucharist in St. *Matthew* to prove the Doctrine of Communion in one Kind. And indeed he will be in the right of it, if he does; for it is certain that he produced them to quite different Purposes; but as certain it is, that this Author's Arguments are perpetually flying in his own Face. And, indeed, one would wonder what it is that can provoke a Person so ignorant in his own Profession, to turn Author. One that is so unknowing in the Scriptures of the New, as well as of the Old Testament, and is so unskilled in Ecclesiastical History, who is at the same Time possessed with the Spirit of Scribbling, must surely make a very contemptible Figure in every Body's Opinion, but his own; where a sufficient Quantity of Conceit will make ample Amends for all those Deficiencies.

BUT to proceed. Mr. *Dupin* says, that the *Emperor* wrote a Letter particularly to St. *Cyril*, to tell him, that *he looked upon him as the Author of this Trouble, and therefore commanded him peremptorily to be present at the Council.* The *Emperor* also sent Count *Candidian* to assist at this Council, as his Commissioner. And when the Day of Pentecost, which was *June 7, Ann. 431*, was come, † *Cyril*, Patriarch of *Alexandria*, with 50 *Egyptian* Bishops, and *Nestorius*, with 10 Bishops from *Constantinople* being come, fifteen Days being also spent, and the Patriarch of *Antioch*, with his Bishops, not being yet arrived, because of the Distance of the Journey by Land. *Cyril*, Bishop of *Alexandria*, and *Jurjenal*, Bishop of *Jerusalem*, and the Bishops of *Egypt* and *Asia* that were present, met in the great Church of St. *Mary*, in *Ephesus*, *June 22*, although, says *Dupin*, *the Legates of the Holy See were not yet come.* And notwithstanding the Opposition of 68 Bishops, who required them to stay till the Arrival of the Eastern and Western Bishops; yet they would not delay any longer proceeding to Business, although they were also opposed therein by *Candidian*, the *Emperor's* Commissioner. For *Peter*, the chief Notary, having in a few Words, declared the Cause of this Council's meeting, they made him read the *Emperor's* circular Letter sent to the Metropolitans, and *Candidian* having produced his Commission, *Cyril* insisted that it should be read, and the Council begin. But *Candidian* declared, that he did not produce

† *Dup. cent. 3. p. 196.*

duce his Commission with an Intent to begin the Council, but to know the Emperor's Mind, and demanded that they should stay till the Eastern and Western Bishops were arrived, saying, *that it was the Emperor's Design to make this a general Council, and not a particular and private Assembly.* And because they would not regard his Advice, he retired, and immediately entered his Protest against the Council. But Cyril, with the rest of his associate Bishops, would not desist, notwithstanding that Nestorius, with above 50 other subscribing Bishops, protested against their Proceedings.

* ON the 10th of July following, Philip and Arcadius, Legates of the Church of Rome, arrived at Ephesus, and joining themselves with Cyril and his Synod, according to their Instructions, by which they were ordered to act in Conjunction with him, they held a Session the same Day. The Legates brought likewise a Letter from the Pope to Cyril, in answer to one written from Cyril to the Pope, wherein he consulted him whether he might still receive Nestorius, the Time which he had fixed being passed; to which the Pope answers, *That we must always receive a Sinner, whensoever he returns, and that we must endeavour to appease the Troubles raised in the Church.* He tells him likewise, *That he earnestly desired, that Nestorius might again repent, and that he may be again received.*

HERE now is the true and real Account of that Council which our Author declares, *was called by the Pope's Authority; and that Cyril presided in it by a Special Commission from the Pope, and in his Name.* Both of which Assertions are so absolutely false, that it is manifest beyond contradiction, that this Council was called by the sole Authority of the Emperor, the very Pretence which Cyril took for beginning the Debate, *i. e.* because the Emperor's Letter for summoning the Council had been read by the Chief Notary, and that the Emperor's Commissioner had produced his Commission, by which Means he insisted upon it, that the Council had been regularly opened, being a sufficient Proof that it was called in the Emperor's Name. And as to Cyril's presiding by a Special Commission from the Pope, and in his Name, it is also manifest that this seditious Ecclesiastick assumed the Place of President, upon the retreating of the Emperor's Commissioner, on the 22d Day of June, 18 Days before the Arrival of the Pope's Legates, or of any Letter that he could possibly receive from the Pope, to this or any

G

other

other Purpose. It is, besides, absurd to suppose, that the Pope should name him President of the Assembly, whose Conduct was to be tried in that Assembly, the Emperor having *peremptorily commanded him to be present, because he looked upon him as the Author of those Troubles*; or to suppose that the Pope should voluntarily Place any other Person above his own Legates. Nor is there the least Word in the Pope's Letter to Cyril, as it is given us by Dupin, that has the least tendency that way.

|| OUR Author allows that the first Council of Constantinople, An. 381, was called by the Emperor without the Pope's participation, but says he, *this was hastily done*. Poor Man! he was hard put to it for an Excuse, when he could not find a better. But it is to be supposed, that he will say the same Thing for the Emperor's summoning the Council at Ephesus, An. 431, when he recollects, that the Emperor's circular Letter, which he sent to the several Metropolitans, to engage them to attend, and to which the Pope obeyed, by sending his Legates, contained these Words, † *That it was his (the Emperor's) Duty to provide for the Peace and Welfare of the Church, to hinder, that it be not troubled with Schisms and Divisions, to provide that Religion be preserved in its Purity, and that the Clergy and Bishops lead unblameable Lives*: Notwithstanding that this circular Letter, which was sent to summon the Bishops to attend, was dated Nov. 19, 430, and the Council was not appointed to meet till the 7th of June, 431.

As to the famous Council of Nice, mentioned by our Author, which was assembled An. 325, ** Dupin positively says, that *this Council was summoned by Order of the Emperor to meet at Nice, a City of Bythinia, about the Month of July, An. 325, in the second Year of Constantine's Reign*; that Sylvester was then Bishop of Rome; who sent thither Victor and Vicentius, his Legates; and to the eternal Shame of this Author and his Assertions, neither the Pope nor his Legates, nor the Bishop of Nice presided in this Assembly, but Hosius, Bishop of Corduba in Spain, probably by Appointment of the Emperor, who was then at Nice. And instead of acknowledging the Supremacy of the Pope, as our Author asserts, this Council is a strong and an early Proof against it. For in the 6th Canon of this very Council are these Words, §§ *We ordain, that the ancient Custom shall be observed, which gives Power to the Bishop of Alexandria, over all the Provinces of Egypt, Libya*

† *Rej. p. 41.* † *Dup. Cent. 5. p. 195.* ** *Dup. Cent. 4.* §§ *Dup. Cent. 4.*

Libya and Pentapolis, because the Bishop of Rome has THE LIKE JURISDICTION over all the ||| Suburbicary Regions. Now the Bishop of *Corke* desires to know what Jurisdiction this Canon gives the Bishop of *Rome*, any where but in his own *Suburbicary Regions*, within the Limits of his own Patriarchate? And whether it does not give *the like Jurisdiction* to the Bishop of *Alexandria*, within the Limits of *Egypt, Libya, and Pentalopis*? And if this be all the Jurisdiction, which the Bishop of *Rome* claims, under the Title of his *Supremacy*, the Bishop of *Corke* would be far from refusing it to him. But the Bishop of *Corke* cannot help observing again, that this Author is very unhappy in his Quotations, and that all his Proofs, like false Allies in the Day of Battle, turn their Swords against the Person, who brought them into the Field.

THE Truth of the Fact is this, that before the Emperors became Christian, the City of *Rome* being then the chief Seat of the Empire, it is reasonable to think, that Persons, most remarkable for their Religion and Learning, would be pitched upon by the generality of Christians, both Clergy and Laity, to fill that See. And when *A.D. 3* the Emperor became a Christian, it is to be presumed, that the Bishop of *Rome* would be greatly and highly respected by him: And that he would be principally consulted in all Ecclesiastical Affairs. The having of a Prince's Ear, is a sure Method of gaining Respect; and it is no Wonder, if upon this Account alone, the Bishop of *Rome* should have a high Regard paid him by all inferior Bishops, as well as by those who lived at a greater Distance from Court, and should be applied to by the Bishops and Clergy in all Disputes between one another, as a proper Person to represent Things truly to the Emperor; which Circumstance, in the Hands of a Set of artful and ambitious Men, might in the compass of one Century, be made use of as a Foundation of claiming a Prescription for Appeals in future Ages: Since by making it a standing Maxim to give Encouragement, and to use their full Interest with the Emperor, in favour of those, who applied to the Bishop of *Rome* for Redress, they would be pretty sure of having Application made to them by one of the contending Parties at least, which

G 2

we

||| The Suburbicary Regions, or the ten Provinces which were under the Jurisdiction of the Temporal Vicar of *Rome*, were, 1. *Campania*. 2. *Tuscia* and *Umbria*, 3. *Picenum Suburbicarium*. 4. *Sicily*. 5. *Apulia* and *Calabria*, 6. *Bruttii* and *Lucania*. 7. *Samnium*. 8. *Sardinia*. 9. *Corfica*. 10. *Valeria*. Which then composed the Patriarchate of the Bishop of *Rome*.

we find by Experience came frequently to be the Case; and in a little Time came to be so great a Vexation and Grievance in the Christian Church, by encouraging Bishops to appeal from their own Metropolitan, and private Clergy to disobey their Bishops, that several very early Canons were made to prevent it. Thus we find in the Council

D. 341. of *Antioch*; || An. 341, that the 14th Canon says, *In case the Bishops of one Province cannot agree about judging of a Bishop, the Metropolitan may call in the Bishops of the neighbouring Province.* And in the 15th Canon it is ordained, *that if a Bishop is condemned unanimously by all the Bishops of the Province, he cannot be judged a-new.* In the Year 418,

D. 418. a Council was called at *Carthage* in *Africa*, the 9th Canon of which enjoins, *that if the Priests and Deacons, and other Clerks, complain of their Bishops Judgment, they shall be judged by the neighbouring Bishops, with the Consent of their own: that if they Appeal from this Judgment, it must be to the Council of Africa, and it excommunicates those who make their Appeals to Judges beyond the Seas.*

THE Reason of all which Proceedings cannot appear in a stronger nor fairer Light, than by reporting a Matter of Fact, related by M. Dupin, to have happened * A. D. 418, which the Bishop will furnish

D. 418. the Reader with in the Authors own Words. “ *Urbanus, Bishop of Sicca, a City of Mauriania Casariensis, did both degrade and excommunicate Apiarius, a Presbyter, as one that had been unlawfully ordained. This Man repaired to Pope Zosimus, who received him kindly, and admitted him to the Communion. This Pope’s Action, contrary to the Rules of the Church, which forbid Bishops to receive those Clerks that are excommunicated by their Brethren, amazed the African Bishops. But † Zosimus seeking an Opportunity to extend his Dominion, and increase his Authority, would not let this Occasion slip. Wherefore he sent Legates into Africa, to cause Apiarius to be restored, and to support their Pretensions they alledged the Canons of the Council of Sardica, which, they said, allowed of Appeals to the See of Rome.*

“ UPON which the *African Bishops*, though they had no Knowledge of any such Canons, yet because the *Pope’s Legates positively*,
urged.

|| Dup. Cent. 4. * Dup. Cent. 5. p. 224. † N. B. This *Zosimus*, An. D. 417, had cited *Proculus* Bishop of *Marseilles*, to appear before a Council at *Rome* for illegitimate Ordinations, and condemned him, as he mentions in several of his Letters; which being submitted to, probably encouraged him to try his Strength also in *Africa*.

“ urged them, promised, out of Respect to that Council, * to
 “ observe these Canons, till they had received out of Greece true Co-
 “ pies of that Council, upon Condition, that if these Canons were not
 “ there, they would not endure this new Yoke, which seemed to be an
 “ Effect of Ambition; and that they should be suffered to enjoy their an-
 “ cient Privileges. These Copies were not long in coming; they
 “ received them in November in the same Year, but they did not find
 “ the Canons alledged by Zosimus’s Legates—which seemed to have
 “ put an End to the Dispute. But after the Death of Zosimus and
 “ Boniface, Apiarius applying himself to Pope Cælestine, he received
 “ him kindly, and admitted him again to Communion, and wrote
 “ in his Behalf to the African Bishops, and sent Faustinus to procure
 “ his Restoration. But the African Bishops having met to examine
 “ this Affair, wrote a Letter to Pope Cælestine, in which, after men-
 “ tioning the Imposition put upon them by Pope Zosimus, they conclude
 “ their Letter with advising him to send no more Clerks into Africa to
 “ see his Judgments executed, lest he should seem to introduce into the
 “ Church, which breaths nothing but Humility, the Pomp and Vanity of
 “ the Age.”

THE Bishop of Corke is sorry to find himself obliged to relate such an infamous Story of a Christian Bishop, lest the Sons of the Philistines should rejoice, and the Offspring of the Uncircumcised should triumph. But the Author of the *Rejoinder* having insisted upon it, that the Bishop of Corke should point out, *Who were the first Authors of Popery? When did the Change happen? Was it from East, West, North, or South?* He thought himself obliged, for the Satisfaction of this Author, to speak the Truth out; and lay before him the pious and catholick Methods, which were pursued by the most early Popes to obtain their beloved *Supremacy*; and now that the Bishop of Corke is once entered upon this Subject, he designs to give this Author a little more Satisfaction upon this Head. But the Reader must not expect to hear speedily of any more such violent Attempts as those practised by Pope Zosimus, because the Pope of Rome had now gotten a Rival in Trade, by the Emperor’s going to reside at *Constantinople*: The Bishop of which City began immediately to vie with the Pope; and, as we shall soon see, got the better of him in a very little time. For in the Council held at *Chalcedon*, in the Year 451. A.D. 451

at

at which the Pope's Legates were present, it was enacted, by the 17th Canon, *That if a Bishop imagines himself injured by his Metropolitan, he may have recourse to the Patriarch of his Diocese, or the Bishop of Constantinople.* And the 28th Canon grants to the Church of the City of Constantinople, which is called New Rome, the same Privileges with Old Rome, because this City is the Second City in the World. It also adjudges to it, BESIDES THIS, the Jurisdiction over the Dioceses of Pontus, Asia, and Thrace, and over all Churches which are out of the Bounds of the Empire. Here indeed was a violent Stride which the Bishop of Constantinople took over the Head of the Bishop of Rome. The Jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome was confined to his own suburbicary Regions: But the Jurisdiction of the Bishop of Constantinople was, by the 17th Canon, enlarged and judged to extend over all other Patriarchs; and was, by the 28th Canon, continued beyond the Bounds of the Empire, even over India and China, and to the utmost Bounds of the Earth. And accordingly it was not long before the Bishop of Constantinople, in a Council held A. D. 586. assumed the

A. D. 586. Title of *Universal Patriarch*; which did not at all agree with the Views and Designs of the Bishop of Rome; but lest the Bishop of Rome should be thought to oppose this only out of Envy, Pope Gregory, who was then Bishop of Rome, disclaims this Title, as well in himself as others; and, in a Letter to the Emperor on this Head, says, that *† the Title of Universal Bishop is against the Rules of the Gospel, and the Appointment of the Canons; that there cannot be an Universal Bishop, but the Authority of all the others would be destroyed or diminished.* || Humility, says a Poet, is young Ambition's Ladder. And accordingly we find, that the succeeding Popes made use only of this Concession, as a Stepping-stone to their own future Grandure. The Point in View at present, was to pull down the Bishop of Constantinople; which, when they had effected, then those very Claims which were before disowned, as being *contrary to the Rules of the Gospel, and the Canons of the Church*, came to be the § avowed Principles and Privileges

† Dup. Cent. 6. p. 78.

|| Shakes.

§ Gregory VII. called a Council of Italian Bishops, wherein it was decreed, That the Pope ought to be called the universal Roman Bishop; that he only has Power to depose and reconcile Bishops; that his Legates ought to preside in Councils; that he only has Power to reconcile Princes; that the calling of Councils was his Right; and that his Sentences ought not to be called in Question. Richter. Hist. Conc. Tom. 10. Lib. 1. p. 755.

leges of the Church of *Rome*: So different is the Conduct and Behaviour of designing Men, in the Days of Adversity, and in the Days of Prosperity, according to the Observation of the Son of *Sirach*, which we find verified in the Practice of those ambitious Prelates, who, a little after, filled the See of *Rome*; *for though they bumbled themselves, and went crouching; yet when they had overthrown their Enemy, they stood up in his Place.* But while the Emperor lived at *Constantinople*, and continued in Power and Grandure, this was not easily to be done. The Business therefore of the Bishops of *Rome* was to shake off the Yoke of the *Emperor* as soon as ever they could, which we shall accordingly find they successfully effected, upon the very first Opportunity; for about the Year 726. † the *Saracens*, *A.D. 726.* having then broken in upon the Empire, proceeded so far as to besiege *Constantinople* itself; and animated one another in their Cruelties upon the Christians, by charging them with Idolatry in the Worship of Images: And therefore *Leo Isaurus*, the then Emperor, to deliver his People from the Violence of their Enemies, and the Church from the Reproach of Idolatry, did, by a severe Edict, command that Images should every-where be taken out of the Churches; and sent his Exhortation to the Bishop of *Rome* to do the like; and published a general Edict to that effect. But *Gregory II.* then Bishop of *Rome*, finding Matters about that time fit for a Revolt, laid hold of this Dispute, as a convenient Pretence for withdrawing his Allegiance from the Emperor, who then resided at *Constantinople*; and instead of complying with this Edict, called a Council at *Rome*, wherein it was decreed, § That the Use of Images should be continued in the Churches;

† *Baron. Annal. An. 726.* † *Pii Pont. decad. Blond. Epit. l. 10. Cjacon. vit. Greg. II. An. 716. Mezeray. An. 740. Zonar. Hist. aer. orient. Sol. 101. Inett's Hist. of the Eng. Church, An. 753.* || *Baron. An. 726.* § *N. B.* The Worship of Images was not then established, but only the Use thereof in Churches was ordered to be continued; which had been long in Practice, by placing them as Ornaments in Churches, without any degree of Worship or Adoration being paid to them: Though even this had been forbidden by the 36th Canon of the Council of *Elberis* or *Elvira*, in the very Beginning of the 4th Century, † *left* † *Dup. Cent. 4. the Object of our Worship and Adoration should be represented therein.* p. 243. But the paying any degree of Worship or Adoration to Pictures or Images, was never established in any Part of the Christian Church, till in a Council held at *Nice*, *A. D. 787.* it was decreed, *That the Adoration of Honour should be paid unto them.* *Conc. Labat. Tom. 7. Col. 390.* See also *Dupin's Hist. of this Council*, where the Arguments he produces, as then made Use of, to establish Image-worship, are a Scandal to Christianity. *Dup. Cent. 8. p. 135—152.*

Churches ; and an Anathema was pronounced against the Emperor, and all that had joined with him in forbidding the Use thereof. And at the same time this factious Prelate wrote a very insolent and haughty Letter to the Emperor, for meddling with Church Affairs, and put a Stop to the Money the Emperor was raising in *Italy* : And not content therewith, he seduced the People and the Army of *Italy* from their Obedience, and raised a Rebellion, which the Emperor was then unable to suppress, on account of the many Difficulties he laboured under from the *Saracens*. Then the Pope proceeded to seize the Exarchate of *Ravenna*, and the Regions of *Pentapolis*, the People having revolted, and * laid violent Hands on their Magistrates, killing the Exarch *Paul* at *Ravenna*. But upon a Quarrel between the Pope, and *Astolphus*, King of the *Lombards*, who had retaken these Places from him, the Pope, seeing he could not keep them to himself, † wrote to the Emperor, and sent Deputies, to let him know that it was high time for him to come with an Army, to defend the Provinces he had yet in *Italy*, if he had a Mind to preserve them : But finding there was no Hope left of any Assistance from the Emperor, he applied himself to *Pepin*, King of *France*, who did freely offer himself to assist the Pope ; and coming with an Army into *Italy*, and defeating *Astolphus*, instead of restoring *Ravenna* and *Pentapolis* to its rightful Owner the Emperor, he piously and liberally made a Donation of them to the Pope ; and ‖ sent his Chaplain, the Abbot of *Fulrad*, to offer the Keys of the said Towns upon the Confession of *St. Peter*, that is, upon his Tomb at the high Altar. This was in the Year of Christ 755. And § hence forward the Popes being temporal Princes, left off in their Epistles and Bulls to note the Years of the Emperors. But the Pope was not yet Master of *Rome*, or the *Campania* which surrounds it ; when ** *Leo III.* therefore was made Pope, A. D. 796. he notified his Election to *Charles* the Great, the Son and Successor of *Pepin*, sending to him for a Present the golden Keys which had been laid on the Tomb of *St. Peter*, and the Banner of the City of *Rome* ; the first as an Acknowledgment of his holding the Territories of *Ravenna* and *Pentapolis*, as a Donation from his Father ; and the other, as a Signification that *Charles* should come and subdue the Senate and People of *Rome*, as his Father had done the Exarchate

* *Newt. Pro. of Dan. p. 77. Innet. Chur. Hist.* † *Dup. Cent. 8. p. 108.*

‡ *Innet. § Newt. p. 79. ** Newt. p. 80.* *Christiana. Dup. Cent. 8. p. 132-133.*

Exarchate of *Ravenna*, and Region of *Pentapolis*. Hence arose a Misunderstanding between the Pope and the City: And two of the Clergy having accused him of Crimes, the Citizens of *Rome*, with an armed Force, seized him, stript him of his sacerdotal Habit, and imprisoned him in a Monastery. But by the Assistance of his Friends he made his Escape, and fled into *Germany* to *Charles* the Great; who, before the End of the Year, sent the Pope back with a great Retinue. And soon after came himself to *Rome*, * where the Enemies of the Pope, to the Number of three hundred, were sentenced to Death, and were beheaded in one Day in the *Lateran* Fields. † He then made a Donation of the City and Dutchy of *Rome*, and its *Campania*, to the Pope, which completed the three Kingdoms, of which the Patrimony of the Pope is at present composed. That is, the Exarchate of *Ravenna*, the Region of *Pentapolis*, and the *Campania* of *Rome*.

THE Prophet || *Daniel*, when foretelling the Dissolution of the *Roman* Empire, says, That it shall be divided into ten Horns, or Kingdoms, and that another Horn shall arise among them, before whom § three of the former Horns shall fall, and shall be plucked up by the Roots. And behold, says he, in this Horn were Eyes like the Eyes of a Man, and a Mouth speaking great things, ** whose Look was more stout than his Fellows; and the same Horn made War against the Saints, and prevailed against them. And in explaining of this Parable, he says, ||| The ten Horns are ten Kings, that shall arise; and another shall rise after them, and he shall be divers from the first; and he shall subdue three Kings; and he shall speak great Words against the most high; and shall wear out the Saints of the most High; and shall think to change Times and Laws. Now it is very remarkable, that of all the Kingdoms that have been erected out of the Ruins of the *Roman* Empire, the Pope alone is the single Prince, who wears a triple Crown, and bears three Keys for his Coat of Arms, as the Emblems of those three Kingdoms, which he was put in Possession of by the Kings of *France*; which seems designed, by Providence, as a Mark in his Hand, and in his Forehead, to point out the Explanation of this Prophecy, in so remarkable a manner, that no body might be deceived therein. For as soon as the Pope had shaken off his Dependence on the Emperor, and was invested with a temporal Kingdom, he began immediately

H

to

* *Newt.* p. 83.† *Newt.* p. 83.|| *Dan.* vii. 7. &c.§ *Ver.* 8. 20.** *Ver.* 20.||| *Ver.* 24.

to think of increasing his spiritual Power; and every Ecclesiastick who could wield either a Pen, or a Tongue, if he had the least Hopes of Preferment, or any other temporal Advantage from the Pope, set his Wits to work to magnify the Power of the Bishop of Rome, as Successor to St. Peter; by which means this little Horn became * *divers from the rest of the Horns*. And having subdued three Kings, *he speak great Words against the most High*, by taking upon himself to grant Indulgences for Sins: And wore out the Saints, in Crusadoes, and Holy Wars: And having a Mouth speaking great Things, he presumed to dethrone Kings, and absolve Subjects from the Obligations of their Allegiance: And putting on a Look more stout than his Fellows, he wore a triple Crown, and gave his Foot, instead of his Hand, to be saluted by those who approached him: And taking Advantage not only of the troublesome times in the Empire, but also of the times of Darkness and Ignorance, with which Europe was at that Time overspread, by means of the Goths, Vandals, and Saracens, who destroyed all Literature where-ever they came: *He made War with the Saints, and thought to change Times and Laws*. He did indeed think to change Times and Laws. † For, as Dupin observes of Pope Hildebrand, who took the Name of Gregory VII. A. D. 1073. || *no sooner was this Man made Pope, but he formed a Design of becoming Lord Spiritual and Temporal over the whole Earth; the supreme Judge and Determiner of all Affairs, both Ecclesiastical and Civil; the Distributer of all manner of Graces, of what Kind soever; the Disposer not only of Archbishopricks, Bishopricks, and other Ecclesiastical Benefices, but also of Kingdoms, States, and the Revenues of particular Persons*. And in another Place he says, that § *his Aim was to bring all the crowned Heads under his Subjection, and to oblige them to hold their Kingdoms as Fiefs from the Holy See, and to govern them at Discretion*. Dupin, indeed, rightly observes, That *he liv'd in Times very lucky for him, and very proper to establish his Pretensions; the Empire of Germany being weak, France governed by an Infant King, England newly conquered by the Normans, Spain in part under the Government of the Moors, the Kingdom of the North newly converted, Italy in the Hands of a great many petty Princes, and all Europe divided in Factions*. In order, A. D. 1078. therefore, to attain his Ends, in the Year 1078. this Pope called a Council

* 2 Thess. ii. 4. † A. D. 1073. || Dup. Cent. 11. p. 33. § Dup. Cent. 11. p. 48.

Council at *Rome*, by the second Canon of which it was decreed, * *That no Clergyman should receive Investiture to a Bishoprick, Abbey, or Church, from the Hands of the Emperor, or Kings, or any other Lay Person whatever.* Now by the feudal Law, Fealty always follows Investiture. And hence comes the Pretence for that Independency of the Church upon the State, which soon after occasioned such long and such violent Disturbances almost all over *Europe*, but particularly in *Great Britain*. For when *Henry I.* usurped the Crown in the Year of our *A.D.* 1101 Lord 1101. in order to defeat the Interest which his Brother *Robert* had at the Court of *Rome*, he recalled *Anselm*, Archbishop of *Canterbury*, who had been driven thither by his Predecessor *William Rufus*, on account of his insolent Behaviour towards the King. But upon *Anselm's* Return, he refused to pay Homage to *Henry*, and refused to stay in *England*, unless the King would pay Obedience to the Pope, and submit to the *Hildebrandine* Doctrine, which declared against the Validity of Lay-Investitures: To which the King refused to submit. But soon after *Robert*, the King's elder Brother, and rightful Heir of the Crown, invading *England*, then *Henry*, to secure *Anselm*, and his Party, promised to submit to the *Hildebrandine* Canons, and those since made by Pope *Urban* in Confirmation thereof. Upon which he was joined by *Anselm*, and made a Peace with his Brother. After which the King, however, retracted his Promise, but sent *Anselm* to *Rome*, to beg it as a Favour from the Pope, that he would permit him to enjoy the Power of Investiture; which the Pope refusing to grant, and declaring it an unalienable Right in the Popedom, *Anselm* was again banished. But the King, some time after, having a Design to deprive his Brother *Robert* of *Normandy*, found the gratifying of the Pope and *Anselm* necessary towards carrying on his Schemes, he therefore consented to give up his Right of Investiture, and was reconciled to *Anselm*, who assisted him in his Designs upon *Normandy*, and quieted the Clergy of *England*, that were uneasy and discontented at the great Taxes raised on them by the King for this Expedition. The King then having conquered *Normandy*, and sent his Brother a Prisoner into *England*, after his Return, made a formal Surrender of his Right of Investiture: Which laid the Foundation for all the subsequent Disturbances that were excited by *Thomas a Becket*, in Opposition to *Henry II.* concerning the Independency of the Church upon the

H 2

the

the State, and by the Pope and his Legates against King *John*, which the King could never quiet; till he resigned his Kingdom to the Pope, and had laid his Crown at the Feet of his Legate. Which will ever be the Consequence of these Principles; for grant but the Church an Independency on the State; and it will soon reduce the State to a Dependency on the Church.

THE Author of the Rejoinder acknowledges, that in * *the 9th and 10th Centuries the Lives and Actions of some of the Pope's were not edifying*. Edifying indeed they were not, for if any Historian had a Mind to pick out Instances of consummate Wickedness, he need go no further than the Lives of the Popes in those and the following Centuries; during which Ages of Darkness and Ignorance, and Wickedness it was, that *the Worship of Images; the Supremacy of the Pope; the canonizing of Saints; the Independency of the Church upon the State; the Use of Indulgencies; Transubstantiation, and the Doctrine of Communion in one Kind; gained Footing in the Christian Church*. Till, by the Blessing of God, the Art of Printing being found out in the 15th Century, Learning was again restored; and as the Cloud of Ignorance began to dissipate, the Reformation of Popery and the Profession of the Protestant Religion spread itself all over *Europe*, which like Christianity at the first, has so wonderfully succeeded in its Progress, that notwithstanding all the Persecutions and Massacres which the Rage of Hell could excite to prevent it, the Professors of the Protestant Religion are at this Day more numerous in *Europe*, than the Papists. For Mr. *D'Fer*, Geographer to the *French King*, allows, that there are more Protestants than Papists in *Germany*; that is in those Territories which belonged to the late Emperor. In *Saxony* the Number of Protestants and Papists is much upon a Level. But every Body must acknowledge that in *European Russia, Prussia, Hanover, the Hans Towns, Sweden, Denmark, the United Provinces, and Great Britain*, the Number of Protestants greatly exceeds the Number of Papists in *France, Spain, Portugal, Italy, and Poland*. It is likewise to be observed, that the same Number of Protestants breed faster than the same Number of Papists, because they have no Nuns or Monasteries among them, and their Clergy are allowed to marry. It is acknowledged, that in *France* alone there are 400,000 Religious of both Sexes under the Vow of Contenance, &c. and in *Italy, Portugal and Spain*, their Number is still

* *Rejoin. p. 34.*

still greater in Proportion to the Number of Inhabitants: By which means Popery daily looses Ground in *Europe*. And as *Daniel* has fixed * a Time and Times, and the dividing of Time for the Continuance of the little Horn, this will amount to † 1260 Years; for in the Prophetic Style a Day stands for a Year, and a Time for a Calendar or Jewish Year of Years, or 360 Years; hence a Time and Times, and half a Time or $360 + 2 \times 360 + \frac{180}{2} = 1260$ Years. And if we suppose the Rise of the little Horn to have been about the Year of our Lord 750, this Horn has already reigned about a Thousand Years, so that there remain about 260 Years still to come before that Time arrives when Pope and Popery shall be no more.

THUS having shewed from the Scriptures, that there is not the least Foundation for Popery in the Gospel of *Christ*; and from Ecclesiastical History that it cannot be supported by the Practice of the Primitive Church, till the Eighth Century at soonest: It is now left to the candid and ingenious Reader to judge for himself whether *Protestancy* or *Popery* has the best Title to be called a Part of the Christian Religion.

THE Bishop, when he first entered into this Dispute, being engaged in a Work, which he trusts in God will be of more Use to Christianity than the refuting so insignificant an Author, was willing to decline all Enquiries into Ecclesiastical History; because he foresaw it would be tedious, as he fears the Reader has found it to his Cost: And has no other Apology to make for his being so explicite, but that he is now writing for the Use of the Unlearned. *Æsop* tells a Story of an Ass that had a Mind to make a Figure in the World, and the better to impose upon his Brother Brutes, issued forth bedecked with a Lion's Skin: Now, in order to expose this Animal to a discerning Eye, it would be sufficient to uncover an Ear or a Hoof, or any remarkable Part: But whoever has a Mind to detect such a Creature, and shew him to a vulgar Assembly, will find that he never will be able to satisfy them, till the Beast is quite stripped.

THE Bishop, therefore, begs his Readers Patience till he just takes Notice of this Author's Apology for the Loyalty of Papists, for Proof of which he refers us to the Government in *Holland*, who employ Papists in their Armies both at home and abroad: But this Author's Knowledge in History or Politicks is not sufficient to make him recollect that *Holland* is but a new erected Republick, which having risen

to

* *Dan*, vii. 24.

† See *Rev*. xii. 6. and compare it with *Rev*. xii. 14.

to its Grandeur since the Reformation, the Pope has never pretended to lay Claim to the Disposal of its Government, or the Revenues of its Churches. Nor is there a Popish Pretender living who lays any Claim to the Dominion of that Country, nor are the Numbers of its Popish Inhabitants so great as to render the Lives of the Protestants any ways precarious. Nor are there any Popish latent Claims to the landed Estates among the *Dutch* preserved in the Hands of Popish Proprietors. But if this was the Case in *Holland*, as it manifestly is in *Ireland*; the *Dutch* would be very far from conniving at those Indulgencies to the Papists among them, that are publickly allowed to the Papists among us.

AND whereas this Author says, * that *if the different Sentiments in Religious Matters must necessarily break that Harmony and Charity, that should unite the Members of the same Body; how do We observe that strict Union and alternate Government supported in several Parts of the Empire between Roman Catholicks and Lutherans?*

THE Bishop in Answer thereto says, God forbid that he should be possessed with such a Spirit of Popery as to imagine that *different Sentiments in Religious Matters must necessarily break that Harmony and Charity, that should unite the Members of the same Body*. He is of Opinion, that even the Temporal Magistrate has nothing farther to say to the Religious Sentiments of those, who live under his Jurisdiction, than as the spreading or propagating of such Opinions may contribute to the Peace or Welfare of Society. And, therefore, that in every Society there ought to be a general Toleration for all Religions, which are consistent with the Peace and Welfare of Society in general; and of that Society in particular.

BUT with regard to the Behaviour of one Man towards another, supposing them both on a Level, either as Fellow Subjects of the same, or as Subjects of different Legislative Powers; the Bishop knows no Reason why Men should bear a greater Ill-will to one another for being of different Opinions, than for being of different Sizes, or for having a different personal Appearance. If one Man is a Christian, and another is a *Jew*, *Turk*, *Infidel* or *Heretick*, there can be no more Reason for having a Dislike on that Account to each other, than because they were not all born in the same Country, or bred up under the same Tutors; since Ninety nine in an Hundred of those
who

* *Rejoin. p. 47.*

who are *Christians*, would probably have been *Mahometans* if they had been born in *Turkey*: And the same may be said of *Jews* or *Mahometans*, that they would have been *Christians*, if they had been born in a Christian Country, or of Christian Parents.

AND if it pleases the Almighty to endow one Man with greater Abilities, or a better Understanding than his Neighbours; or to appoint the Place of his Birth, where he has better Opportunities of being informed in true Religion; or better educated in the Paths of Virtue; these are Blessings for which he ought to be thankful to his Creator; but are far from being a Reason why he should bear any Ill-will to those Persons, who have not received the same Advantages from Providence. It is indeed the Duty of all Mankind, and of the Christian Clergy in particular, so far to be concerned for the Welfare of their Fellow Creatures, as to endeavour by all peaceable and gentle Methods to reclaim their wandering Brother, and bring him in to the Paths of Truth. But far be it from the Professors of Christianity to attempt the effecting of this good End by the means of Violence and Persecution: Since Force may indeed make Hypocrites or Martyrs, but can never make Profelytes.

WHENEVER, therefore, the Bishop finds these Rules broken through, and sees Men persecuting one another under Pretence of Religion, he always suspects that there is more of Temporal Interest, at the Bottom, than Spiritual Love; because he does not think it an unnatural thing, for Men either to defend themselves, or attack others with Violence where their Temporal Interest is concerned. But when this is not the Case, and that the Opinions contested have nothing to do with our Temporal Interests, then the Bishop is of Opinion that the enacting of any Sanguinary or Penal Laws against those who differ in Opinion from us, upon the Accounts of those Tenets in their Religion which are purely Spiritual, and do not manifestly tend to the Prejudice of the Temporal Interest of the State, could not be justified. And were it not for the Doctrines of *the Supremacy of the Pope*; the *Independancy of the Church upon the State*; and the Power of dispensing with the Allegiance of Subjects towards their lawful Sovereign, which the Popes of *Rome* have so often exercised and claimed as a Right, when they have quarrelled with Temporal Princes; together with the Attachment which those of the Popish Religion must have to the Person of the *Pretender*; which Principles are inconsistent with the Temporal Interest

Interest and Welfare of our present Constitution ; he is fully persuaded that the Papists would have a Right to be placed upon a Level with all other Dissenters from the established Religion of the Country ; and be equally entitled to the Benefit of a Toleration.

BUT as to what this Author adds, when he says, *how do we observe that strict Union, and alternate Government, supported in several Parts of the Empire, between Roman Catholicks and Lutherans?* The Bishop cannot help observing, that this Author expresses himself much in the Style of the Fly on the Cart-wheel, when he said, *What a Dust we raise!* For the Bishop apprehends that by the Word, *we*, he means the Papists in *Germany* ; and then the Bishop answers to this Question, that this Union and alternate Government, is indeed, very ill preserved on the Side of the Papists. For though the Preservation of the Rights and Privileges of the Protestants, as well as of the Papists, is one of the fundamental Articles in the present Constitution of the *Empire* ; yet every Body knows, with what Difficulty it is, that the Protestant Electors and Princes, can preserve that Article from being daily encroached upon, by a Set of Factious, Cruel, and Turbulent Ecclesiasticks. The barbarous Treatment which the *Palatines* formerly met with ; the Broils and Disturbances at *Tborn* ; and the late Sufferings of the *Salzburgers*, being so many Proofs, within our own Memories, of the persecuting Spirit of Popery, whenever it is not restrained by superior Force from sporting itself with Blood.

It is a long Time since it has been resolved by many of the Casuists in the Romish Church, that it is lawful to disguise the Sentiments of their Religion, not only in private Conferences, but in the very Pulpit itself, when there is a sufficient Reason for doing it : And every Body must know, that the Propagation of their Religion is thought a sufficient Reason for doing of any thing ; their Professions therefore of Loyalty and Submission to *the Powers that be*, must always be understood with this Salvo, of being *Subject to the Reprehension of their Church Superiors*.

BUT as this Author insists much on the Loyalty of the *Irish* Papists, with regard both to King *Charles* the first, and King *Charles* the second ; the Bishop, lest he should be thought partial in this Affair, begs leave to transcribe some Paragraphs out of the Memoirs of *Roger*, Earl of *Orrery*, lately printed along with a Collection of Original Letters,

fers, wherein this Pretence of the Loyalty of the *Irish* Papists towards these two Princes, will, as he apprehends, be set in its true Light. For upon the King's Restoration, * "The *Irish* Papists having presented to his Majesty, a Petition, wherein they remonstrated their great Oppression, and their *Loyalty* in the Wars; begging to be restored to their Estates and Liberties, unjustly taken away from them. The *English* in *Ireland*, had early Notice of this Petition, and solicited, that there might be a fair hearing allowed at the Council Board in *England*, by Deputies on both Sides; which reasonable Request was soon granted, and the Day of hearing appointed.—Before the Day of hearing came, the *Irish* Commissioners apprehending, that no Person whatever could so much injure their Cause as Lord *Orrery*, were desirous to buy him off, offering to give him 8000*l.* in Money, and to settle on him and his Heirs 7000*l.* per *Ann.* if he would not appear at the Council Board against them. And his Lordship, with a generous Disdain, having rejected the Motion." The Day of Trial being come, and Sir *Nicholas Plunket* having spoken in behalf of the *Irish* Papists. Then Lord *Orrery* rose, and after a short introductory Speech, "He then produced a Paper, which he desired might be shewed to *Plunket*, and the other *Irish* Commissioners, to know whether they would own the Names there subscribed, to be their Hands. My Lord of *Ormond* seeing it, told *Plunket*, certainly it was his Hand; and *Plunket* and the rest seeing the Paper, acknowledged they were their Hands. Then my Lord desired the Paper might be read, which accordingly was done, and it appeared to be an Order, or Declaration, made at the *Irish* Supreme Council, wherein they resolved unanimously, to prosecute the Lord of *Ormond*, their Lord Lieutenant, and his Party, with Fire and Sword. Upon which the Earl of *Orrery* only said, by way of Remark, these were very loyal Subjects indeed, who declared War against his Majesty's commissioned Lieutenant. His Lordship then told the Board, this was not all; they should see, that the *Irish* had not only declared War against his Majesty's Lieutenant, but had also, by *Plunket* and one more, offered the Kingdom of *Ireland* to any foreign Prince, who would take it into Protection. And then his

“ his Lordship delivered another Paper to his Majesty, desiring the
 “ Gentlemen of the *Irish* Commission to declare, whether the Names
 “ there subscribed also, were not theirs. They seeing it, could not
 “ deny it was their Hand. Lord *Orrery* desired it might be read,
 “ and the Paper appeared to be Instructions to Sir *Nicholas Plunket*,
 “ and one more, to go to the Pope, and in their Names, (calling
 “ themselves the Supreme Council of *Ireland*) to offer that Kingdom
 “ to his Holiness; and if he refused it, then to the King of *Spain*;
 “ if he refused it, to the King of *France*; if he refused it, to the
 “ * Duke of *Lorrain*; and if he refused it, then to any other Catholick
 “ Prince.” And such is the Loyalty of the Papists to this very Day;
 which though no Persons talk of more, yet no body thinks of less;
 for while there is a Popish Prince in being, that either pretends a
 Claim to, or would accept of the Crown of these Realms, it must be
 the utmost Folly to suppose, that the restless and ambitious Spirits of
 these Ecclesiasticks will not be perpetually devising Methods, how to
 place it on his Head.

THUS having seen what admirably loyal Subjects these *Irish* Papists
 were to King *Charles* the second, let us enquire a little into their Be-
 haviour towards King *Charles* the first. And here the Bishop thinks
 proper to observe, that he is far from suspecting the Loyalty of the
 Papists, whenever the Interest of their Religion requires that they
 should be so; or, from supposing that they will not always be ready,
 in a Civil War among Protestants, to join with one Side, in order to
 cut the Throats of the other. *Charles* the first was unfortunately mar-
 ried to a Popish Wife, the Papists had therefore better grounded
 Hopes of coming into Play, from the Success of this Monarch, than
 of the adverse Party; and, though it may be safely affirmed, that few
 Men were, either better grounded in the Principles of the Protestant
 Religion, or more averse from Popery than that unfortunate Prince;
 yet it may be as safely affirmed, that if ever the Papists joined their
 Arms along with those of his Majesty King *Charles* the first, that it
 was only when they found they were not strong enough of themselves
 to destroy the Protestants without help; and that then they only join-
 ed the King, because they hated the Republicans more than him. In
 order to prove which, the Bishop takes the Liberty of transcribing a
 few more Paragraphs out of the forementioned Memoirs, where that
 Author

* See this confirmed in *Clarendon's Hist.* Tom. 3. p. 136. & *Glanvil's Memoirs*, p. 150, &c.

Author says, ||| that “ after Lord *Brogbil's* Marriage, he went into
 “ *Ireland*, where he arrived that very Day the Rebellion broke out
 “ in that †† Kingdom ; but it was not known then in *Munster*, that
 “ the *Irish* Papists were in Arms, and therefore he landed safely, and
 “ brought his Lady to *Lismore*, his Father's chief Mansion-house.
 “ About two or three Days after he waited on his §§ Father at *Castle-*
 “ *Lyons*, where the Earl of *Barrimore*, who had married Lord
 “ *Brogbil's* Sister, had invited them to Dinner. They met at *Castle-*
 “ *Lyons* Lord *Muskerry*, and some others of the *Irish* Nation, all
 “ Papists, with whom they were very free and familiar. But it hap-
 “ pened, while they were at Dinner, a Gentleman came to my Lord
 “ of *Corke* with Letters, who before he could be persuaded to sit
 “ down, desired to speak with his Lordship in private, and then
 “ with horror in his Face, told him the *Irish* had been in Rebellion
 “ three Days ; that *they had committed many Outrages and Cruelties up-*
 “ *on the English* ; and that all the Country, from *Leinster* down to-
 “ wards *Clonmel*, (through which he had passed) the *Irish* Rebels
 “ were in Arms, so that he was forced to choose all the by-ways he
 “ could find, that he might bring these sad Tidings to his Lordship.
 “ My Lord of *Corke* would discover no Surprize at this dismal News,
 “ but desired him to sit down to Dinner, and say nothing. As soon
 “ as Dinner was over, my Lord of *Corke* opened his Packet, wherein
 “ he found Proclamations to warn the *English* to be on their Defence ;
 “ declaring withal, the Rebellion and the Discovery of it His
 “ Lordship communicated the Account to the Company then present,
 “ but Lord *Muskerry* seemed to make light of it, and treated it as a
 “ ridiculous Thing, without Truth or Foundation. However, they
 “ all forthwith prepared to return to their several homes ; and my
 “ Lord *Corke* sent Notice of the Tidings he had received, together
 “ with the Proclamation, to Sir — *St. Leger*, then Lord President
 “ of *Munster*. But the next Account was, that Lord *Muskerry* him-
 “ self was up in Rebellion in the Western Parts, with many thou-
 “ sands of *Irish*. And now every Day brought in fresh Tidings of
 “ the *Calamities* of those Times ; whereupon my Lord of *Corke* sum-
 “ moned in all his *English* Tenants, and with them, and others that

I 2

“ came

||| *Orrery's* Letters, and Mem. chap. 2. †† A. D. 1641. §§ The Earl of *Corke*.

“ came in voluntarily, they made up some Companies of Foot and
 “ Troops of Horse, to the Number of about five hundred. § When
 “ the Rebellion became universal, Lord *Brogbil* and his Brothers were
 “ commanded to attend the Lord President *St. Leger*, who accord-
 “ ingly joined him with their Troops against the *Irish* Rebels. *St.*
 “ *Leger* hearing that Lord *Muskerry* was marching with an Army of
 “ three thousand Men towards *Limerick*, thought good to oppose him
 “ in that March, with the best Forces he could summon together,
 “ which amounted to no more than one thousand five hundred, or
 “ thereabouts, most of them raw and unexperienced Men. How-
 “ ever, *St. Leger* was resolved to set upon *Muskerry*, wherever he
 “ could find him; and accordingly drew up his Men near *Ballylow*
 “ Hill, which he had no sooner done, than *Muskerry* appeared, and
 “ drew up his Men also in Battalia near him, which *St. Leger* perceiv-
 “ ing, prepared for a Battle; for he was a Man of great Valour, Con-
 “ duct and Loyalty. But while he was ordering his Men for the Bat-
 “ tle, there came a Trumpet from *Muskerry*, and one Man with him,
 “ whose Name, I think, was *Walsh*, a Lawyer. *St. Leger* who was then
 “ in Company with the Earl of *Barrimore*, the Lord *Kinelmeaky*, and
 “ the Lord *Brogbil*, sent out to know the meaning of the Trumpet’s
 “ coming, who declared, that he came to speak with the Lord Pre-
 “ sident about a Business of very great Consequence to the Kingdom.
 “ *St. Leger* gave immediate Notice to the Trumpet, and to the Per-
 “ son who was with him, that they might approach. As soon as
 “ they came near enough to be heard by the President, and the rest,
 “ who stood at the Head of the Army, *Walsh* told the Lord President,
 “ he must speak with him alone, some few Paces off from his Men.
 “ The President and the other Noblemen, seeing *Walsh*, and know-
 “ ing him, began by expressing great Wonder, that a Person of his
 “ Parts and Education, should be guilty of such a Madness, as to join
 “ with Rebels. But *Walsh* replied, they were no Rebels, as he would
 “ soon convince them, if he might but speak with the Lord Presi-
 “ dent in private. The Lord President being a stout Man, was
 “ ready to have entered into such a private Conference, but the Lords
 “ that were with him demurred upon it, not thinking it safe, that
 “ the General of their Army should be trusted alone with an Enemy;

“ and

“ and therefore, they told Mr. *Walsh*, they could not allow a private Conference with him, but if he would speak with the Lord President, it should be in their Presence; upon which *Walsh* threatned to withdraw, without delivering his Message. But at length it was agreed, that *Walsh* should have Liberty to talk privately with the Lord President, yet so as a Party might be placed on either Side of them, while they were at their private Parley. Upon these Terms *Walsh* met the Lord President, and being without the hearing of his Guard, he told that Lord, in few Words, that his Lordship ought to take heed of fighting against them, for Lord *Muskerry* had a Commission from the King for what he did; and by virtue of that Commission, he had raised Men to assist the King in all Extremities; and that if he might have a free and safe Conduct, he would bring the Commission to him under the Great Seal, and shew it him at his own House the next Morning.

“ THE Lord President was mightily surprized at this Message, and having assured *Walsh* he should have safe Conduct, if he would bring the Commission next Day, dismissed him. When this Dialogue was over, he returned to the Lords, who were impatient to hear what the Subject of the Commission had been, the Lord President immediately told them, the whole of *Walsh*’s Discourse, at the hearing of which all were astonished. But Lord *Brogbil* observed to the Lord President, that this must certainly be a Cheat; and that the King would never grant out Commissions to those, whom in his Proclamation he had declared Rebels; and therefore desired the Lord President, diligently to peruse the Commission if it were brought, the bringing of which he much doubted, but thought the Message rather to be a Blind, to amuse them, while *Muskerry* pass’d by. They agreed at last to expect the Arrival of *Walsh*, the next Day, at the Lord President’s House, which lay within a few Miles of the Place where they were, and in the mean Time they encamped their Soldiers. *Muskerry* also, upon the return of *Walsh*, drew off his Men, and the next Morning *Walsh* appeared again in the Lord President’s Quarters, with a Trumpet, who was immediately conducted to the Lord President’s House, where being received, *Walsh* renewed the same Request, that he might speak with the Lord President alone in private, which the
“ other

“ other Lords opposed. But at last it was agreed, that only one
 “ Man should stand at the Door, with a drawn Sword, and charged
 “ Pistols. This being done, *Walsh* produced a large Parchment,
 “ wherein was a very formal Commission drawn up for the Lord
 “ *Muskerry*, to raise four thousand Men, and the Broad Seal affixed
 “ to it. *St. Leger*, having read it over, dismissed *Walsh*, and re-
 “ turned to the Lords, declaring to them, that *Muskerry* had
 “ really a Commission for what he did, and that he would dismiss
 “ his Men, and stir no more in this Business, saying, he would die
 “ before he would be a Rebel. Whereupon the Lords all withdrew
 “ to their several homes; only Lord *Broghil* declared, he could not
 “ but think it a Cheat, as he afterwards found it,

FOR some Time after the Restoration, the Lord *Broghil*, then Earl
 of *Orrery*, having gone to wait upon the Duke of *Ormond* at *Kilkenny*,
 he there met with the Lord *Muskerry*; § “ and took an Opportunity
 “ one Day, when alone with Lord *Muskerry*, who happened then
 “ to be in a pleasant open Humour, to ask him, how the Rebels ob-
 “ tained that Commission which they shewed to the then Lord President
 “ *St. Leger*, under the King's Great Seal? Lord *Muskerry* answered,
 “ I will be free and unreserved with you; it was a forged Commission
 “ drawn up by *Walsh* and others, who having a Writing to which
 “ the Great Seal was fixed, one of the Company very dexterously took
 “ off the sealed Wax from the Label of that Writing, and fixed it to
 “ the Label of the forged Commission.

“ LORD *Orrery* struck with the Wickedness of this Transaction,
 “ could not refrain expressing himself to that Purpose to Lord *Mus-*
 “ *kerry*, who laughingly replied, It would have been impossible to
 “ have held the People together, without this Device.

THE Bishop of *Corke* now leaves it to the Readers own Reflexions
 to judge of the Principles of these People, who could in a friendly
 Manner come to eat and drink at their Neighbour's Table, at the
 same Time that they were meditating upon Methods to satiate them-
 selves with their Neighbour's Blood, and that of his Protestant
 Friends; and when they could not effect this by Force, shewed their
 Loyalty to their Prince, by forging a Commission in his Name,
 which made him more Enemies, and had in other Respects a more
 evil

evil Effect upon the Minds of his Protestant and truly loyal Subjects, than perhaps any one Transaction that happened in the whole Course of his Reign. The Bishop therefore concludes with this one Observation, that the Papists of our own Days, as well as those in the Reign of King *Charles* the first, are the true Sons of the Catholic Pope *Zosimus*; and that Popery has continued to support itself, and impose upon Mankind, by the same villainous Methods that it first began to rise; by corrupting the Scriptures; falsifying ancient Records; and forging of new ones.

F I N I S.

will reflect upon the Methods of his Predecessor and truly loyal Subjects
than perhaps any one Transgression that happened in the whole Course
of his Reign. The Bishop therefore concludes with this due Observa-
tion, that the Papists of our own Days, as well as those in the Reign
of King Charles the first, are the true State of the Catholic Pope's
Aims; and that Popery has continued to support itself, and increase
upon Mankind, by the same villainous Methods that it first began to
rise; by corrupting the Scriptures; falsifying ancient Records; and
forging of new ones.

16 MAR 1661

